The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXVII, No. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1952

CONTENTS

Spain and Religious Freedom ... *George W. Shea* 161

A New Conjugal Morality ... *Edouard Gagnon, S.S., and Aidan Carr, O.F.M. Conv.* 173

The Sociology of a Southern Parish ... *Paul Hanly Furfey* 182

Chalcedon, St. Thomas Aquinas, and the Concept of Person ... *William R. O'Connor* 194

"Monstra te esse matrem" ... *Charles Dreisoerner, S.M.* 200

Extreme Unction: A Pastoral Brief ... *Winfrid Herbst, S.D.S.* 205

Parochial Schools and Special Education ... *William F. Jenks, C.SS.R.* 211

"This is a Deep Mystery" ... *Thomas Plassman, O.F.M.* 217

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Presence of God in the Soul ... 225

The Sacraments for Dying Non-Catholics ... 225

A Problem in Pastoral Prudence ... 226

Compline Ceremonies ... 227

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1952, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Distribution of Holy Communion 228

Asperges Ceremony 228

Mass Ceremonies 229

Holy Communion in Hospital 229

Surplice in Hearing Confessions 230

Marriage in the Sanctuary 230

BOOK REVIEWS

Man and Society, *by Francis J. Haas* 232

Memories of Pope Pius X, *by Cardinal Merry del Val* 235

Gregorian Chant Analyzed and Studied, *by Marie Pierik* 237

Catholic Moral Teaching on the Distribution of Profits in the Modern Corporation ..... *by George Francis Bardes* 238

The People's Priest, *by John C. Heenan* 239

At Your Bookstore

Manual of

Forty Hours' Adoration

(New and Revised Edition)

THIS Manual Contains LITANIAE ET PRECES: the Approved Music for "Te Deum" and "Tantum Ergo," and everything requisite for the Devotion—Ceremonies, Rubrics and Prayers.

Order copies now, so that they will be on hand when needed, as they are sure to be.

Thirty cents per copy.

The Catholic University of America Press
620 Michigan Avenue, N.E.
Washington 17, D. C.

for men of action
Father Montcheuil's penetrating essays on the spirituality problems of laymen.
$3.00
2nd printing

christian design for sex
A comprehensive study of sex from a Catholic viewpoint prepared by Father Buckley, S.M. Develops principles and attitudes needed by teachers and parents.
$3.50

many are one
Highlights the social nature of the Catholic Church. Father Leo Trese has done much to bring theology within the grasp of all.
$2.50

at all bookstores

fides
21 w. superior street
chicago 10, illinois

SPAIN AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Not many months ago, Pedro Cardinal Segura y Saenz, Archbishop of Seville, was the target of sharp, even rude, criticism leveled by a few American Catholic editors, who find it difficult "to understand the Spanish mentality," and feel that "it is past time for American Catholics to be relieved from the oppressive burden of our Spanish brethren."

What aroused the ire of these editors was the Cardinal's insistence, in his Lenten pastoral of last March, that the civil authorities enforce fully those laws of the land which impose certain restrictions on Spain's Protestants. The critics attacked the theological premises of this demand—the Cardinal's concept of Catholic theory on Church-State relationship, and/or his views on how that theory ought to be applied in present-day Spain.

In due course, rebuttal was forthcoming from Spanish quarters, then surrebuttal from the American side. After providing some necessary background, the present article recapitulates this controversy, and undertakes to suggest that the Spanish prelate is on sounder theological ground than his American Catholic critics.

According to a statement by Spain's Minister of Foreign Affairs, published in *L'Osservatore Romano*, March 26, 1952, Spain's Protestants number 20,000 in a total population of 28 million, and half of them are foreigners. The legal position of Protestants in Spain is set forth in the sixth article of what is fundamental law of the nation, the 1945 *Fuero de los Españoles*, or Spaniards' Charter of Civil Rights, which was approved both by the Cortes and by the national plebiscite of July 6, 1947.

Substantially the same as the eleventh article of the old Spanish Constitution which was in force from 1876 to 1931, this sixth article of the Charter was drawn up after consultation with the Holy See, and reads: "The profession and practice of the Catholic religion, which is that of the Spanish State, enjoy official protection. No one shall be molested for his religious beliefs, or in the private exercise of worship. No external ceremonies or manifestations other than those of the Catholic religion shall be permitted."

It should be noted that, far from attempting to compel non-Catholics to adopt the Catholic faith, the law protects the individual

conscience. "No one shall be molested for his religious beliefs." As Cardinal Gibbons once put it, conversion and coercion are two terms that can never be reconciled. Forced conversions would be in utter conflict with the express teachings and laws of the Catholic Church, which recognizes that, by their very nature, religion and the act of faith must be voluntary. For example, the Code of Canon Law (canon 1351) warns tersely: "No one is to be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will."

Accordingly, Spanish law leaves everyone free to continue unmolested in his religious convictions, and also in the private exercise of his chosen form of worship. This free exercise extends moreover, to regular church services. According to the figures given by the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the statement cited above, Protestant worship is carried out in some 200 chapels, which, incidentally, gives the 20,000 Protestants a proportionately larger number of places of worship than the number at the disposal of the Catholic population. Likewise, the number of Protestant ministers is proportionately larger than the number of priests serving Spain's Catholics. In Cardinal Segura's own Seville, three chapels are at the command of the city's 600 Protestants.

Forbidden to non-Catholics resident in Spain are all religious ceremonies and demonstrations of an external or public character, and public propaganda, such as outdoor proselytizing. In keeping with this prohibition, Protestant places of worship may not have the outward appearance of a church, nor may signboards or nameplates be used to indicate what the buildings are. Nor, it appears, may handbills be circulated to advertise the services.

Fearing that the civil authorities were growing lax in enforcing these restrictions, Cardinal Segura protested, in his now famous Lenten pastoral.[1] Among other things, the prelate declared: "The civil power cannot renounce its duty of defending and promoting the true religion duly known as such (the Catholic religion), and should defend it in function of the norms of this religion. . . Spain cannot in any wise accord to Protestants the same rights as to

[1] Dated Feb. 20, the document was published March 9. Sections are reproduced in *La documentation catholique*, April 20, 1952, cols. 477-480. Cf. *ibid.*, cols. 476-477, for data and statistics on Protestants in Spain. See also, for further background to the Segura pastoral, *The Tablet* (London), March 22, 1952, pp. 226-28.

Catholics, in what concerns the *public* practice and affirmation of their beliefs."

The pastoral met with prompt and, in some instances, severe criticism from the editors of *The Indiana Catholic and Record* (March 14), *The Commonweal* (March 21), and *America* (April 5; see also March 22).[2] In their judgment, the Cardinal's position on the limitation of religious freedom for Spain's Protestants is backward, and not at all required by assured Catholic doctrine. A similar verdict was rendered in the May issue of *Herder-Korrespondenz,* a leading Catholic publication in Germany.

On May 12, *The New York Times* carried a report of a vigorous reply to the American criticisms, appearing in the then current issue of *Ecclesia,* which is the official organ of Catholic Action in Spain and tends to reflect the mind of the Spanish episcopate. Reprinting in full the joint Instruction issued on May 28, 1948, by the Conference of Spanish Metropolitan Archbishops, *Ecclesia* let it be understood (thus correcting what seems to have been the impression of some critics) that Cardinal Segura's views on the question of religious liberty in Spain, far from being more or less peculiar to himself, are shared by the nation's hierarchy as a whole. In an editorial in the same issue, *Ecclesia* rejected the American editors' criticisms, and, in support of the Spanish stand, quoted from the Encyclicals of Pope Pius IX and Pope Leo XIII.

In a statement made to *The New York Times* (May 12), commenting on *Ecclesia's* reply, Rev. Robert E. Hartnett, S.J., *America's* editor-in-chief, indicated that the controversy stems from disagreement among theologians in determining the fundamentals of Catholic theory on Church-State relations.

"On the general issue of Church-State relations," Father Hartnett declared, "two different views are in competition today in Catholic circles. The Spanish view is perhaps the more common. The other is the more liberal view, which is, as a matter of fact, also widely held."

Therewith, Father Hartnett was tacitly appealing to the more liberal view, which says that the State is on principle bound to be

[2] The three editorials are reprinted in the May issue of *The Priest,* which presents them "as expressions of the attitudes of the average American priest."

impartial and to yield equal rights to all religions. The stricter view, on the contrary, maintains that *per se* the Church should enjoy a preferred status and the special protection of the State.

However, the Jesuit editor did not mean to rest his case exclusively on the more liberal view of Church-State relations. An editorial in the May 24th issue of *America* asserted that the weekly's position on Spain is justifiable even "in the context of the view of Church-State relations more commonly held by Catholic theologians," and was presented in that context in the editorials of March 22 and April 5.

Thus Father Hartnett feels that his position can be successfully defended on one or the other of these alternative grounds. Presumably, his fellow critics of Spain rely on a like defense in depth. In the opinion of the present writer, however, the position of all these critics is precarious on either ground.

To begin with, insofar as they wish to take refuge in the more liberal theory of Church-State relations, this is shaky ground indeed. In behalf of the Spanish bishops and of the stricter theory of Church-State relations, one could quote, as was undoubtedly done in the *Ecclesia* editorial, the signal passages in Pope Leo XIII's Encyclicals *Humanum genus* (April 20, 1884), *Immortale Dei* (Nov. 1, 1885), and *Libertas praestantissimum* (June 20, 1888). But since these lengthy passages were reproduced in a fairly recent number of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*,[3] they need not be repeated here. The space thus won can profitably be devoted to a random selection from the many other papal statements which are significant for the stricter theory of Church-State relations.

Though he was not the first to provide relevant materials, we may start with Pope Pius VI. In an allocution pronounced in the secret consistory of March 29, 1790, this Pontiff deplored the fact that France was then debating "whether the Catholic cult should or should not be maintained as the dominant religion of the State," and he declared that "kings are the ministers of God for good, they are the children of the Church and her defenders, obliged by this title to love her as their mother, and to serve her interests and to

[3] Cf. *AER*, 123, 3 (Sept., 1950), 170-72; or, *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1930), pp. 97 f., 110 f., 121, 150 f.

vindicate her rights."[4] French abolition of the Catholic religion as the State's "dominant" one was also scored in the same Pope's Apostolic Letter of March 10, 1791, *Quod aliquantum*.[5]

According to Pius VII's Encyclical *Diu satis*, May 15, 1800, Christian kings and heads of States should be, in the language of *Isaias* 49:23, "foster-fathers" of the Church.[6] In his Apostolic Letter *Post tam diuturnas*, April 29, 1814, to the bishop of Troyes, Pius VII rejoiced that the Church had regained her liberty in France, but bitterly lamented the fact that the new French Constitution, making no mention of the Catholic religion or even of God, failed to re-establish the Church in her rightful splendor and dignity, and decreed instead full liberty and equality for all cults; in conclusion, the Pope wished the French king to be reminded of his duty of devotion to and defense of the cause of the Catholic faith.[7]

Leo XII, writing against Masonic and other secret societies in his Apostolic Letter *Quo graviora*, March 13, 1825, exhorted Catholic rulers to remember their duty of assisting and protecting the Church; frequent quotations from earlier Popes, as Benedict XIV, Clement XII, and even Leo the Great, underline the continuity and antiquity of this papal insistence on the duties of civil rulers.[8]

Similarly, Gregory XVI, in his celebrated Encyclical *Mirari vos*, Aug. 15, 1832, and in the Encyclical *Inter praecipuas*, May 8, 1844.[9]

Because they are quite well known, we may pass over the more authoritative documents of Pius IX (*Quanta cura*, *Syllabus*, and associated documents), in favor of his letter of Nov. 20, 1863, to Napoleon III.[10] There the Pontiff urged the sovereign to strive that "above all there be restored, especially in Catholic countries,

[4] Cf. G. Michon (editor), *Les documents pontificaux sur la democratie et la société moderne* (Paris: Les Éditions Rieder, 1928), pp. 32, 33.

[5] Cf. L'Abbé Raulx (editor), *Encyclique ("Quanta cura") et documents* (Bar-le-duc: L. Guerin, 1865), II, 21.

[6] Cf. *ibid.*, 124 f.

[7] *Ibid.*, 130-33, 136 f.

[8] *Ibid.*, 155-58, 179 f.

[9] *Ibid.*, 215, and 215' (addendum).

[10] Cf. P. Pirri, S.J., *Pio IX e Vittorio Emmanuele II dal loro carteggio privato, II: La Questione Romana, Parte II: I Documenti* (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 1951), p. 255.

the absolute pre-eminence which naturally (*naturalamente*—in the first draft of the letter: *di sua natura*) belongs to the Catholic religion, as the only true one (the first draft added: *la quale fra le tante essendo l'unica vera, ha tutto il diritto di sovrastare ad ogni altra*)."

Noteworthy also is the first article of the Concordats concluded with Ecuador under Pius IX in 1862 and under Leo XIII in 1881:

"The Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Religion will continue to be the Religion of the Republic of Ecuador, and will perpetually be preserved there intact, with all the rights and prerogatives which it should enjoy from God's ordinance and canonical sanctions. For which reason, no cult or society which has been condemned by the Church can ever be permitted in the Republic of Ecuador."[11]

Lack of space prevents mention here of many other relevant papal utterances, not a few of which derive from more recent Popes. Even so, the materials thus far adduced suffice to make us understand why it is that theologians more commonly subscribe to the stricter theory, which holds that in a Catholic or predominantly Catholic country the Catholic Church should enjoy a preferred status and the special protection of the State.

To quote from one able exponent of this theory, Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.:

> If the country is distinctively Catholic—that is, if the population is almost entirely Catholic, and the national life and institutions are permeated with the spirit of Catholicity—the civil rulers can consider themselves justified in restricting or preventing denominational activities hostile to the Catholic religion. This does not mean that they may punish or persecute those who do not accept the Catholic faith. But they are justified in repressing written or spoken attacks on Catholicism.[12]

The same theologian points out, and with him all—Spaniards included—will agree, that the foregoing doctrine does not apply to a nation like the United States, where the religious affiliations of

[11] Cf. V. Nussi, *Conventiones inter S. Sedem et civilem potestatem* (Moguntiae: F. Kirchheim, 1870), p. 350, and J. Restropo Restropo, S.J., *Concordata regnante, S. D. Pio PP. XI inita*, editio completa (Rome: Pontifical Gregorain University, 1934), p. 8, continuation of note 2.

[12] Pamphlet, *Freedom of Worship* (New York: Paulist Press), p. 10.

the citizens are so numerous and diverse, whence the common good requires that all religions have equal rights.[13]

American Catholics may, therefore, and do sincerely accept the separation of Church and State in the U.S.A. Singly and collectively, American bishops have repeatedly approved this separation, as in the American Hierarchy's statement of November, 1948:

> Authoritative Catholic teaching on the relations between Church and State, as set forth in papal encyclicals and in the treatises of recognized writers on ecclesiastical law, not only state clearly what these relations should normally be under ideal conditions, but also indicates to what extent the Catholic Church can adapt herself to the particular conditions that may obtain in different countries.
>
> Examining, in the full perspective of that teaching, the position which those who founded our nation and framed its basic law took on the problem of Church-State relations in our own country, we find that the First Amendment to our Constitution solved the problem in a way that was typically American in its practical recognition of existing conditions and its evident desire to be fair to all citizens of whatever religious faith.[14]

Pope Leo XIII himself, after setting forth, in the Encyclicals already referred to, what the relations between Church and State should normally be under ideal conditions, went on to concede that special circumstances existing in different countries could authorize a departure from the ideal relations. A first instance is this passage in *Immortale Dei:*

> The Church, indeed, deems it unlawful to place the various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion, but does not, on that account, condemn those rulers who, for the sake of securing some great good or of hindering some great evil, allow patiently custom or usage to be a kind of sanction for each kind of religion having its place in the State.[15]

And in the Encyclical *Libertas praestantissimum* the same Pontiff declared:

[13] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 15.

[14] R. Huber, O.F.M. Conv. (editor), *Our Bishops Speak* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1952), p. 150.

[15] *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, p. 127.

> For this reason, while not conceding any right to anything save what is true and honest, she [the Church] does not forbid public authority to tolerate what is at variance with truth and justice, for the sake of avoiding some greater evil, or of obtaining or preserving some greater good. . . . But if, in such circumstances, for the sake of the common good—and this is the only legitimate reason— human law may or even should tolerate evil, it may not and should not approve or desire evil for its own sake.[16]

These papal concessions pave the way for a correct understanding of the case of Eire. Though Eire's Constitution of 1937 acknowledges Catholicism as "the Faith professed by the great majority of the citizens," its religious clauses do not make Eire an exclusively Catholic State; the non-Catholic denominations in existence at the time of the Constitution's promulgation are recognized by name, and religious freedom is guaranteed. This fact has been frequently and somewhat misleadingly invoked in the polemic against Spain, almost as though Eire represented the Catholic ideal of Church-State relations.

The truth is that Eire stands rather as an example of the legitimate compromise sanctioned by Leo XIII in the passages just quoted. The justification of Eire's Constitution lies in this, that those who drafted it anticipated that the six counties of northern Ireland would eventually bring their large Protestant population under the same government as the twenty-six counties.[17] Moreover, almost one-tenth of Eire's population is non-Catholic (in contrast with Spain's ratio of less than one non-Catholic per thousand of population).

Compromise, too—legitimate, but still compromise—is the U. S. A. Writing to American Catholics in his Encyclical *Longinqua oceani,* Jan. 6, 1895, Leo XIII acknowledged with pleasure the equity of America's laws, but warned that the separation of Church and State in America, while praiseworthy because of this country's circumstances, should not be taken as the ideal arrangement, normative for all other countries:

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 157.

[17] Cf. A. and M. Bromage, "The Irish Constitution," *Review of Politics,* II (1940), 161. According to the *National Catholic Almanac* for 1952, Northern Ireland had in 1946 a population of 1,362,000, of whom 500,000 were Catholics; Eire had 3 million inhabitants, 290,000 of them non-Catholics.

> The Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and government of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance.
>
> Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced.
>
> The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition . . . is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself. But she would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.[18]

In the light of the over-all teaching of Leo XIII and of the other Popes whom we have adduced, it should now be possible to appreciate the attitude of the Spanish bishops. The doctrinal principles on which their attitude relies were set forth in the joint Instruction issued May 28, 1948, by the Conference of Spanish Metropolitans, which, as has been said, was reprinted as part of *Ecclesia's* reply to the critics of Cardinal Segura.[19]

The Instruction pointed out that, as regards tolerance and freedom of worship for non-Catholic denominations, Catholics must be guided by the principles contained in dogma and in public ecclesiastical law, which principles have been authentically interpreted in various Encyclicals of modern times. In *Libertas praestantissimum*, Leo XIII rejected the view that man's natural freedom includes the right to practice any religion he pleases; truth is the norm of freedom; the principle of religious neutrality on the part of the State is an error. According to the same Encyclical, State toleration of non-Catholic denominations is justifiable only under certain circumstances, in order to avoid a greater evil or to preserve some greater good; in decreeing toleration under such circumstances, the State may go only as far as the common good requires. Now, the Instruction continued, Spain is statistically and factually a Catholic country;

[18] *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, pp. 323 f.

[19] For a summary of this Instruction, cf. *Herder-Korrespondenz*, Dec., 1948, pp. 108 f.

the number of non-Catholics in Spain is so slight that toleration of them by Spanish law cannot be reckoned as a requirement of the common good. . . .

To put their argument briefly: authentic Catholic doctrine teaches that the ideal arrangement of Church-State relations calls for a preferred and especially protected status of the Catholic Church, and that such status should be maintained in the absence of circumstances which would render the theoretically ideal arrangement less desirable in practice. And, the Spanish prelates add, such circumstances do not obtain in Spain; therefore the *status quo* should be preserved.

As has already been remarked, Father Hartnett's response to this argument is a double one. First of all, he is disposed to deny that authentic Catholic doctrine does, in fact, teach the "Spanish view" of the ideal Church-State relationship. His preference lies rather with what he admits to be the minority view, the more liberal theory as to the ideal Church-State relationship.

This theory, it will be remembered, holds that the State should, *per se,* yield equal rights to all religions, as in the U. S. A. When confronted with the pronouncements of Leo XIII and of other Popes which conflict with this view, its proponents try to meet the difficulty by declaring that such pronouncements were historically conditioned by the circumstances of the times, and should not be taken as proclaiming, throughout, a perennially valid theory of Church-State relations. We are told to distinguish between the doctrinal and the polemical content in, e.g., Leo XIII's Encyclicals; the former exhibits the authentic and perennially valid teaching of the Popes on Church and State (reducible to this: of the State the Church demands only her freedom); the latter exhibits transitory positions taken by the Popes in response to the times (e.g., insistence on "religion of the State").

However, in the opinion of champions of the stricter theory on Church and State, satisfactory proof of this daring interpretation of papal utterances has yet to be produced. And they would welcome from proponents of this interpretation more light on a variety of matters. For example, is it meant that the Popes made in their own minds the same distinctions as are employed by the more liberal school; or did they rather put forward as doctrinal what the more liberal school dismisses as polemical? *Longinqua oceani* shows

clearly that "liberty of the Church," such as she enjoyed in the U.S.A., was far from being the only element in Leo XIII's concept of the ideal Church-State relationship. Recall also Pius VII's *Post tam diuturnas,* which rejoiced at the Church's recovery of her liberty in France, but deplored the fact that Catholicism was not returned to its position as "religion of the State." Another source of misgiving is the fact that the 1948 Statement of the American Hierarchy, quoted above, is predicated on the more commonly accepted theory of Church-State relations.

Therefore, rather than rest his case on the shaky ground of the more liberal theory of Church-State relations, *America's* editor-in-chief seeks to defend his position even within the "context of the view of Church-State relations more commonly held by Catholic theologians." His reasoning runs that, even if the ideal Church-State relations be what the latter theory conceives them to be, the theory itself allows a departure from the ideal when circumstances warrant it. Now, his argument continues, such circumstances do exist—if not in Spain itself, then at least in the world as a whole; the condition of Protestants in Spain has harmful repercussions on Catholics elsewhere in the world, especially in the U.S.A. Hence, "one can argue that in the situation of the world at large, religious liberty in Spain is an ethical imperative."

In reply to this, it must be pointed out that Pope Pius XII, who surely has the best interests of all Catholics as much at heart as anyone else, does not seem to share the opinion that religious liberty in Spain is an ethical imperative.

One indication of this is the fact that the Holy Father endorsed the privileged position of the Catholic Church in Spain when, on June 7, 1941, the Holy See entered into a Convention with the Spanish government, which stipulated that the first four articles of the Concordat of 1851 be continued in force.[20] The first article of that Concordat declared that the Catholic religion continues to be the recognized religion of Spain, "to the exclusion of all other cults."[21]

[20] Cf. *AAS,* 33 (1944), 480-81.

[21] Cf. Nussi, *op. cit.,* pp. 281 f.

A further indication is the fact that the sixth article of the 1945 *Fuero de los Españoles*, quoted earlier, was drawn up after consultation with the Holy See.[22]

Finally, we submit, as significant not only for the present point but also for the whole controversy on Church and State, the following passage from an epistle of the S. Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, date March 7, 1950, addressed to the Brazilian Hierarchy:

> Another error, equally condemned by the Church, should be avoided by the Christian: Liberalism. It denies that the Church, by reason of its most noble end and of its divine mission, possesses a natural supremacy with reference to the State. It admits and encourages the separation of the two powers. It denies to the Catholic Church the indirect power over mixed matters. It affirms that the State should show itself indifferent in religious matter . . . ; that it should concede the same liberty to truth and to error; that the Church is not entitled to privileges and favors or rights greater than those conceded to the other religious confessions, not even in Catholic countries. . . . Now, one should bear in mind, today as in the past, that where the circumstances render it advisable, one can make use of tolerance towards false religions and doctrines, but where such circumstances are not verified, the rights of truth should be maintained and men should be preserved from error. The Christian who speaks otherwise betrays his faith, gives impetus to indifferentism, and deprives his fellow citizens of the benefit which the devotion to and love of truth offers them.[23]

GEORGE W. SHEA

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington, New Jersey

[22] Cf. *The Tablet*, March 22, p. 227.
[23] *AAS*, 42 (1950), 841.

A NEW CONJUGAL MORALITY?

The upsurges of theological opinion within the bosom of the Church are an irrefragable testimony to the driving vitality of Catholic thought, but to pretend that all Catholic-inspired innovations constitute evidence of an easy adaptability to current trends is to belie reality. Truth is no chameleon. The beauty of Catholic doctrine lies chiefly in this: it is essentially an immutable deposit of truth, divinely prepared for man's salvation. It is a safe-conduct guarantee through a hazardous terrain. While taking full account of human weakness, it has none of that soft, humanistic sentimentality that is ever ready to do business with intrinsic evil.

The allurements of false "irenicism" condemned by Pope Pius XII in *Humani generis* of August, 1950, do not limit their charms to the realms of dogma, scripture and philosophy. Moral theology—as a conclusion from dogma—is peculiarly fitted to assume attractive but false fronts, simply because practical life at times makes immediate demands upon human activity far beyond the obvious content of speculative truth. The vagaries of costume that error dons are legion. As *Humani generis* points out, some modern writers advance their opinions cautiously and in a way that conceals their real meaning. Behind a façade of overly subtle distinctions, Birnam Wood-like, the errors move on the Dunsinane hill of orthodoxy.

May we respectfully call the attention of the clergy to a case in point? A very recent, quite appealing, but extremely dangerous doctrine has been spawned in France, and it is but recently commencing to insinuate itself into Catholic thought on our own continent.[1] Briefly, it is an attempt to justify onanism by an appeal to a principle of subjectivity. It is actually a moral booby-trap for the unwary, deceptively wrapped in a bewitching package.

[1] A clear expression of this doctrine first appeared in an article written by Canon Jacques Leclercq for the French pastoral review *Le prêtre et la famille* (Paris, 1950, pp. 7 et sqq.), published by the "Association de Mariage Chrétien." The doctrine there expounded has since passed over to the American continent in an article "Changements de perspectives en morale conjugale" in the *Revue Eucharistique du Clergé* (Montreal, Sept.-Oct., 1950, pp. 454 et sqq.). The footnotes to the present article refer to the Canadian publication.

Last November Pope Pius XII spoke to the Congress of Italian Catholic Midwives. Among other things, the Pontiff declared that the prescription against onanism holds good today just as much as it did yesterday. It will hold tomorrow and always, for it is not a mere precept of human reason but is the expression of a natural and divine law. It seems providential that the Holy Father's clear and forceful reiteration of the prohibition of the natural law against the intrinsic evil of contraception in any form should come on the heels of a novel, provocative, and probably heretical doctrine. That this unacceptable opinion has not yet been particularly noted in American circles is simply because it is only now starting to assert itself here.

A False Freedom

The proponents of this new doctrine—of course no error is ever entirely new—seem convinced that the changing circumstances of our times must be taken account of, and to this extent, that traditional conjugal morality should be modified. What until now has remained a rather vague feeling among some extremists, has now been expressed with open frankness and considerable éclat. At least this much can be said for the novelty: it would make the confessor's task a hundredfold easier in his dealing with onanists. But as daily experience shows one, what is easy and what is right are often at variance. Over-simplification is at best a hazardous shift in moral matters.

One logical conclusion flowing from an acceptance of the proposed doctrine would be to allow a confessor to absolve persons who, under traditional moral teaching, would have seriously to promise amendment before being validly absolved. An "Open Sesame" would be handily provided to married partners who happen to find classic but "outmoded" conjugal morality too constricting. The heralds of this movement solemnly proclaim liberation from an unbearable burden to those who are too weak or else are victims of circumstances. But this is an illusory freedom. One's awakening is rude where morality is flouted. Or even where it is simply "adapted" to the exigencies of the moment.

The reasoning advanced by the exponents of this changed perspective is subtle enough, and is prefaced by the disarming assurance that there is no intention of contravening traditional conjugal

morality. And to dissipate any fear one might have that "something is rotten in Denmark," the confessor is reminded that he must use the greatest prudence in employing the principles formulated by the new doctrine.[2] But what seems forgotten or conveniently ignored is that strictures imposed on a doctrine's application can hardly transform a doctrine's essential character.

The Warp and Woof

The fabric of the teaching we here contest is woven of these threads:

1. A Christian morality necessarily believes in the Redemption, and it does so in such wise that it advocates a steady perspective of optimism relative to salvation, particularly in view of contemporary society's insistent anxiety to free itself of a morality it judges impossible to observe and therefore unjust. And in consequence of its impracticality, the inflexible moral rule becomes—as far as the great mass of modern people are concerned—non-existent.[3]

2. On the other hand, Faith, as right reason itself, does not permit one to deny objective morality, which is an ideal clearly corresponding to the demands of our human nature. Observance of this ideal, when possible, undoubtedly leads one to perfection.[4]

3. Face to face with this ideal, and conscious of his deficiency, man admits to himself that he is at grips with something bigger than himself, and so a double reaction is possible, depending on one's character. If one is proud, he molds morality to his own likeness, with a false subjectivism that assures him that what he does can not be wrong because he does it, and must do it. *But,* if one is blessed with a sense of Christian humility he will readily admit that "objectively he is a sinner."[5] While aware of his unworthiness, still he is not unduly cast down nor does he despair. He remembers that God loves him and so all his objective faults are engulfed in the infinity of that divine love.[6]

[2] "Changements de perspectives en morale conjugale," in *Revue Eucharistique du Clergé* (Montreal, 1950), p. 457.

[3] Cf. *op. cit.,* p. 460.

[4] Cf. *op. cit.,* pp. 458-60.

[5] *Op. cit.,* pp. 460-61.

[6] *Op. cit.,* p. 459. The exact wording of this text, of capital importance, is as follows: "Le chrétien porte constamment en soi la conscience de son indignité, mais celle-ci ne peut, ni le troubler, ni l'abattre, ni diminuer son

This latter is not, we are reassured, the "faith without works" preached by Luther. It is rather salvation by one's good will coupled to faith in God's mercy. This confidence in divine mercy finds a happy support, humanly speaking, in this distinction between objective and subjective morality: what is *of itself* contrary to morality and the divine law, ceases to be subjectively imputable if the law becomes practically-speaking impossible for one to observe, as if he were no longer master of his acts.[7]

Application of the Principles

The principles above explained are applied by their sponsors to the question of contraceptive marital relations in this way:

Suppose there arises a conflict between the objectively established requirements of conjugal chastity and the need of preserving domestic peace and understanding. This conflict may be rooted in the inability of spouses to have any (or any more) children without compromising the mother's life, or perhaps without dangerously jeopardizing the already precarious financial status of the family. They maintain that they can not practice perfect continence and—for them at least—Rhythm is no solution. Surely, the argument continues, no one is bound to the impossible!

Even if the impossibility to abstain is attributable to the weakness of the husband or wife, isn't it best and even needful to solve the case by excusing them of all subjective fault, or at least of all grave wrong? For who can judge what is impossible for another? Who (besides God) can determine the limits of one's individual possibility? The passions of the flesh vary from one person to another. One meets people, the argument goes on to add, who are otherwise thoroughly obedient to all the demands of morality, but who flatly assert that marital chastity is simply an unrealizable ideal so far as they are concerned. They feel they can have no more offspring, at the same time they can not refrain from marital intercourse.

---

potentiel vital, parce qu'en même temps, il se sait aimé et sait que toutes ses fautes disparaîtront dans l'infini de l'amour, du moment qu'il se reconnaît pour ce qu'il est, qu'il ne s'attribue pas ce qui n'est qu'à Dieu et s'abandonne à l'amour. Ce n'est pas le salut par la foi sans les oeuvres, comme le voulait Luther, mais le salut par la bonne volonté humaine et la foi en la Miséricorde."

[7] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 464-66.

Caught on the horns of this dilemma, to what degree are the spouses accountable if they do have onanistic relations? One who commits an objective fault, it is replied, because one is unable actually to be in command of his situation, is excused of blame. It is not, the proponents of the new morality hastily allow, that the rule of morality ceases to exist. One ought indeed remain devoted to the rule, regret that he himself can not observe it, and meanwhile fervently hope that the day will soon come when he can personally abide by it.[8]

The *fautores* of this system play upon one's heartstrings. They tell us of cases where the husband has become embittered and nervously unstrung by enforced continence, with the result that the home becomes a veritable hell. Or else one's wife turns into an object of hatred because she is a continual but unsatisfying source of temptation. Is not, we are asked, the duty of maintaining a happy home a primordial marital duty? And does not this harmony in turn depend upon a mutually satisfying sex life? And further, if another pregnancy would perhaps prove fatal to the wife, would not the husband commit a grave sin in making her pregnant?

To sum up this argument: Since conjugal intimacies are a requisite condition for an affectionate and full marital life, and since the proximate occasion of sin for the parties in question consists precisely in these necessary intimacies, therefore they are not guilty of sin if they perform the almost inevitable marital act in an onanistic manner. The proviso is added that they must not want the sin *as such,* would be happier if their situation were otherwise, and truly hope that circumstances will in time alter for the better in order that they may avoid this unfortunate difficulty.[9]

This merciful (!) solution is thus applied to a very carefully described case, but from it are deduced some "simple rules" enabling vexed confessors to judge similar cases, and thus to remove any subjectively grave culpability from practices hitherto considered evil. These "simple rules" are:

[8] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 465: "Si vraiment ces époux ne peuvent se contenir, dans quelle mesure sont-ils responsables? Celui qui commet une faute objective, parce qu'il n'est pas capable de se dominer, est excusé de sa faute. . . . Il n'en résulte pas que la règle morale tombe. Il doit y rester attaché, regretter d'être incapable de la respecter et souhaiter d'y arriver. . . ."

[9] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 466-67.

1. The first sign of due orientation of one's will is due orientation of one's life viewed in its entirety. One who manifests a desire to serve God in everything else, but "sins" in the matter under discussion because of circumstances independent of his will, can not be presumed to have sinned mortally.
2. The sign that the "sins" are caused by circumstances independent of one's will appears in this: if in the past, when these unfavorable circumstances were not present, one observed habitually and with ease the moral law on this point. And because of this previous fidelity he feels sorrow now that he can no longer himself respect that same moral law.[10]

Evaluation of the New Solution

What judgment may properly be formulated on the evidence adduced in support of the novel doctrine? A judgment, first of all, that prescinds from any merely external authority and disregards the accidental reasons of convenience to which it so urgently appeals. A solution to a complex problem of morality does not become correct and acceptable simply because it happens to be pleasing and seems to answer genuine difficulties. Our scrutiny must go to the heart of the matter.

The promoters of the changed perspective argue that married people often are not prepared to accept traditional morality in this connection; that confessors achieve nothing by their "brutal providentialist attitude";[11] that present economic and social conditions impose a need for prudence in determining the number of offspring;[12] that conjugal spirituality does not admit of an absolute continence which may well strain the bonds of love and even shatter the harmony of the home.[13]

Such a point of view eschews the hope offered by supernatural faith; it ignores the evidence developed in favor of a large family by sociology, psychology and medicine. And even granting—for the sake of the argument—the truth of the opposition thesis—has one therefore the right to countenance contraceptive practices? May a confessor absolve a penitent without more ado, once he discovers a vague good will? All other reasoning is peripheral com-

[10] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 472.
[11] *Op. cit.*, p. 473.
[12] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 549.
[13] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 462.

pared with this central point: the intrinsic and unnatural quality of any use of the generative faculty by which the spouses perform the act destined to beget offspring, and yet endeavor to remove from that act its natural efficacy.[14]

In view of the objective malice of a penitent's actions, can a confessor excuse him by agreeing that he is not at all fully responsible? The opposition writes: "The classical treatises on moral theology appear to be especially occupied with Christians of bad will, or at least more or less badly disposed. Besides, these treatises have been too prone to judge men habitually responsible for their acts."[15] Is this not a generalization injurious both to the penitent and to the moralist, to suppose that men are *not* habitually responsible for their acts, or that moralists have over-stressed the negative aspects of human volitional activity?

And if this alleged irresponsibility is a reality, whence comes it? From some habitual incapacity to act in a human manner? But surely moral theology has always excused the faults of the mentally ill. Does it stem from invincible ignorance about the sinful character of onanism? That is hardly likely considering the publicity accorded the matter in Catholic circles, in parochial missions, in sermons, in instruction classes.

The new doctrine is prepared to excuse many onanists of grave fault *because no one is held to the impossible.* A risky sort of moral optimism, that! Like the optimism of the ostrich supposing itself snugly safe from danger when its head is cozily buried in the sand. To acknowledge oneself objectively a sinner, and to take refuge in the divine mercy can easily become a Quietistic doctrine and therefore an exceedingly dangerous one. Such an appeal to God's mercy comes with ill grace from a camp unwilling, *a priori,* to examine the problem of conjugal chastity in terms of God's supernatural Providence. A confessor who absolves a penitent pleading incapability to observe the commandments of God in married life makes short shrift of the words of the Holy Spirit: "And God is

[14] Cf. *Casti connubii* (N.C.W.C. translation, p. 20): ". . . any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offence against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of a grave sin."

[15] *Op. cit.,* p. 470.

faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able: but will make also with temptation issue, that you may be able to bear it" (*I Cor.*, X, 13).

Even if one admits the hypothetical possibility of there being an impossibility to observe conjugal chastity, that "impossibility" can be nothing else, in the final analysis, except a moral weakness. A weakness due in part perhaps to external circumstances, but due particularly and formally to a defective control of the sexual appetite. In his November address to Italian Midwives, the Holy Father excoriated this very teaching when he said that God does not oblige people to do the impossible, and so if for certain reasons some married couples must abstain from marital union, in such cases abstinence is possible.

One who would hold for the blameless character of any acts of onanism on the claim that it can not be otherwise, would by the same token have to exculpate: an adolescent whose solitary sins would no longer be chargeable to him since personal purity is for him an "impossibility"—an engaged person who anticipates married rights because marriage is not here and now possible—an unfaithful husband whose heart is helplessly given to his mistress—an unjustly deserted wife who seeks "compensation" with one not her husband. Indeed, in very many instances, the observance of the moral order demands heroism. But, as the Pope declared in his address to the Italian Midwives already referred to, it is wronging men and women of our times to deem them incapable of continuous heroism, a heroism that need not stop at the borders established by the passions and the inclinations of nature. Obviously, one who does not want to dominate himself *is* incapable of so doing.[16]

A Choice that Must be Made

One must not only engage in a sustained effort to avoid sin; one must struggle also against the very conditions that make sin so likely. This is to demand sanctity of souls. No one can say that he is powerless in the face of temptation unless and until he has exhausted the possibilities of recourse to God and of mortification of self. And that is never. The "impossibility," introduced by this

[16] Cf. the address as reported *verbatim* in the *Brooklyn Tablet* (New York, Nov. 10, 1951), p. 6.

novelty to shore up its facile solution to real difficulties, does not lift the force of obligation from the divine law. It does not excuse the blame of those who succumb to sin. In certain regrettable circumstances of contemporary life it is extraordinarily hard to work out one's salvation. But worked out it must be, or all is lost. Even though grave inconvenience sometimes excuses from positive law, still it never excuses from natural law.

One who would tolerate weakness of the flesh among the young whose marriage is retarded by the unfavorable economic organization of society, or who would countenance unchastity among the married, renders them no service either here or hereafter. God is wise and good. His law is clear and practicable. In the full observance of it alone can man find happiness. The profound and dreadfully real difficulties experienced by some married couples in their efforts to reconcile Christian virtue and personal gratification should remind them that mediocrity is not their lot.

They must choose between Christ crucified and their own sinful pleasure; between the gracious acceptance of sacrifice and a life of sensual pleasure that offends their God and opens the floodgates of remorse and unhappiness. The priest who would seek the glory of God will not look for an easy solution to the problem. He will look for a true one, albeit a hard saying. He will bring the troubled penitent to understand God as a loving Father Who aids His children to perfect themselves and to save their immortal souls.

To offer as a plausible hypothesis the doctrine that the moral law is ever unobservable—even if all men transgressed it by their sins—is to deny divine wisdom. And man can not do that without ceasing to be a man.

EDOUARD GAGNON, S.S.
Grand Séminaire de Montreal, Canada

AIDAN CARR, O.F.M.Conv.
St. Anthony-on-Hudson, Rensselaer, N. Y.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF A SOUTHERN PARISH

A good deal of comment has been evoked by Fr. Fichter's study of the parish quite thinly disguised as "St. Mary's" in the southern city of "Riverside."[1] The report will doubtless be widely quoted in future discussions of Catholic parish life. For this reason it seems desirable to examine the volume more thoroughly than would be possible in the conventional book review.

Broadly speaking, the book deals with the liturgical and other public activities of the parish. The activities of parish societies are omitted since they were reserved for treatment in another volume. The parochial school is mentioned only incidentally when the participation of its pupils in religious functions is discussed. Except for these deliberate omissions, Fr. Fichter's treatment is very thorough. He gives due attention to Mass and evening devotions, the administration of the various sacraments, preaching, retreats, and all cognate topics. He does not neglect even the casual visits of the parishioners to their church when no services are going on (pp. 232-36). The coverage seems very complete.

Fr. Fichter's method of reporting happily combines the descriptive and the statistical. His descriptions are well written, lively, and interesting. Much of the statistical material is presented in tables and graphs so that it does not overburden the text. The graphs are well drawn.[2] It is perhaps a minor defect that, while the graphs have titles, the tables do not. However, one can satisfactorily interpret the latter from the column headings and the context. One might wish that certain statistical material, for example, that on the ethnic composition of the parish (figs. 5-7, pp. 26-28), were presented in tables as well as in graphs so that it could be read off more accurately. These, however, are trifling

[1] Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., *Southern Parish. Volume 1. Dynamics of a City Church* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951). This is the first volume of a projected four-volume report. In a recent article, Paul Courtney (pseud.), "The 'Southern Parish' Case," *Commonweal,* LV (Nov. 30, 1951), 191-93, it is stated that the remaining three volumes have been suppressed. The present writer knows no official confirmation of this report.

[2] In fig. 16 (p. 66) the numerals above the graph seem to be displaced toward the left so that one tends to read each quantity presented 100 units too high.

criticisms. As a readable presentation of technical material, the book is very good.

It is unfortunate that Fr. Fichter gives a most inadequate description of the methods by which he gathered his raw data. On p. viii he lists the names of ten "researchers" and tells us that they participated in "a thorough group discussion of several hours' duration every Saturday morning." On the same page he gives the names of six priests who "obtained valuable information in personal interviews with parishioners." On p. 14 a "preliminary canvass" and a "census" are mentioned. In the course of the book Fr. Fichter occasionally cites his "observers" in connection with attendance counts or incidents reported or mentions "census returns" as a source of information. Beyond this, the reader is told nothing. In reports of social research it is customary to give in some detail a description of the methods used, the difficulties encountered, and the means devised to overcome them. With this background the reader can form some opinion on the accuracy of the material presented. In *Southern Parish* the data are simply presented as facts without the auxiliary material necessary to justify their accuracy.

One can form some opinion on the accuracy of the reporting from an extrinsic source. A committee of three was appointed by the Ordinary of "Riverside" to examine the book. The committee was composed of the Officialis of the diocese, an urban pastor, and a seminary professor. Two of the three members are domestic prelates and two are synodal judges. Certainly the joint statement of such persons cannot be lightly brushed aside. It is interesting to read their report. On p. 93 of the book there is a quite circumstantial account of a renewal of baptismal vows on the occasion of confirmation before the pastor "seated on a chair on the platform of the altar." The committee brands this combination of ceremonies "a fabrication" and adds, "This did not take place, nor is it known to ever take place in the entire city of ['Riverside']." Can one trust observers who report, in some detail, a non-existent ceremony? Again, on p. 68 of the book, the total number of Communions received in the parish during the survey year is given as 59,524. On the other hand, the committee states that, according to "official reports to the Diocese," the number for the corresponding year was 83,000. Fr. Fichter has suggested[3] that "the Sister

Sacristan or one of the assistants threw away thousands of stale, unconsecrated hosts during the year." However, the committee report allows for this. It states, "The financial records show that actually 87,000 hosts were purchased that same year." Under the circumstances the reviewer feels compelled to accept the statements of *Southern Parish* with a certain reserve.[4]

It is too bad that the methods used in the census are not described. How were the census takers trained? What instructions were given them? Were their results spot-checked for accuracy? What was done about residents of the area who were not at home when the census taker called or who refused to give information? One wishes that a copy of the census schedule had been printed in an appendix.

As a result of the lack of precise information about the census, it is impossible to understand exactly what Fr. Fichter means by the term "parishioner." This is unfortunate, since the "parishioners" are the group with which the whole study is principally concerned. The only relevant information is given on p. 14. There we read of a "house-to-house canvass" of the area in which there were found "a little less than eleven thousand white persons who listed themselves as adherents of the Catholic faith."[5] Fr. Fichter continues, "A detailed census schedule was then brought to all those households listed as white Catholic in the preliminary canvass. Many of these refused the schedule because they 'no longer practiced the faith.' From this survey it was discovered that 6,436 persons could be considered members of the parish." To these were added 291 "non-Catholic spouses in mixed marriages." This gives a total of 6,727 and these are the "parishioners." The group in-

[3] In a mimeographed paper entitled "The *Southern Parish* Controversy" which he has kindly made available to me.

[4] The ecclesiastical committee also states that the ceremony of confirmation itself is incorrectly described and that the National Shrine collection amounted to $711.03 (as shown by the check sent to the Chancery) instead of $258.00 as stated on p. 195, footnote. The report of the committee will be hereafter cited as *Committee Report*.

[5] Is this group identical with the 10,946 "white baptized Catholics" mentioned in the legend of fig. 1 (p. 19)? If so, one may infer that there are no apostates in the parish; for every baptized Catholic still lists himself as an adherent of the Catholic faith.

cludes 608 who "say that they never attend" Sunday Mass.[6] This causes a minor mystery. Several thousand "white baptized Catholics" were *excluded* from the category of "parishioners" because they "no longer practiced the faith"; yet 608 were *included* although they had completely renounced their obligation of Sunday Mass.[7] Perhaps there is some simple and logical explanation of the mystery; but, if there is, it is not given in the report. As things stand, it is hard to see what Fr. Fichter means by "parishioners." He does not mean "practical Catholics," for a large minority of them do not even go to Sunday Mass at all. He does not mean "baptized Catholics," for they number 10,946. The unfortunate result of this uncertainty is that, while the book deals almost exclusively with the religious activities of St. Mary's "parishioners," the reader never knows the precise meaning of the term.[8]

Another disconcerting feature of *Southern Parish* is the amazing number of computational errors. Eighteen errors of division have been listed in the accompanying table.[9] Three additional errors occur on pp. 140, 141, and 143 where pairs of percentages are given which do not total as they should. For example, in the last of these three pages, one reads that 27.94 per cent of the communicants were children and 72.94 per cent were adults, the total thus being 100.88. The reviewer found, in addition, 26 rounding errors.[10] A "rounding error" is the type of error one would make,

[6] See p. 153. These are apparently identical with the "over six hundred adults who admit they never go to Mass" mentioned on p. 14.

[7] Also included were 1,117 who did not perform their Easter duty. See p. 68.

[8] When Fr. Fichter talks about the religious obligations of "parishioners," he is always careful to exclude the 291 "non-Catholic spouses in mixed marriages" whom he had previously classified under that term, as well as the 1,155 "white Catholic children below the age of seven." This, of course, is as it should be. However, there seems to be a queer error on p. 40 where the number of "dormant Catholics" is placed at 4,219. This figure was presumably obtained by subtracting from the 10,946 "baptized Catholics" the 6,727 "parishioners" *including the 291 non-Catholics in that category.* Of course the proper subtrahend would be the 6,436 *Catholic* "parishioners."

[9] Note that the dividend on p. 62 is the sum of two numbers given in the text. In connection with the second error on p. 51, note that the text is obscure, but the reviewer's interpretation seems to be the only possible one.

[10] They occur on pages 18 (three errors), 27, 38 (four errors), 50 (two errors), 67 (five errors), 95, 112, 169, 220, 228, 261, 262, 263, 264 (two errors), and 265.

for example, by writing two-thirds (to two significant figures) as 66 per cent, instead of 67 per cent, or (to four significant figures) as 66.66 per cent, instead of 66.67 per cent.[11] This makes a total of 47 computational errors of one sort or other found by the reviewer who, however, does not claim by any means to have made a complete check. There were comparatively few cases in the book

SOME COMPUTATIONAL ERRORS IN *SOUTHERN PARISH*

Page	*Divisor*	*Dividend*	*Quotient* *As Given*	*Quotient* *Correct Value*
34	6,727	276	40.93*	41.03
38	1,443	631	43.70**	43.73
39	10,946	4,219	38.49**	38.54
51	647	364.6	56.19**	56.35
51	494.1	129.5	32.50**	26.21
62	20	2,962	148.6	148.1
67	23	2,005	87.15	87.17
67	23	1,290	55.65	56.09
67	29	1,525	52.95	52.59
67	23	1,122	49.65	48.78
67	23	1,560	67.80	67.83
67	294	21,698	73.83	73.80
73	4	230	56.0	57.5
105	1,925	1,424	74.03**	73.97
105	1,925	291	15.06**	15.12
110	245	213	87.94**	86.94
228	532	356	67.01**	66.92
228	131	29	22.51**	22.14

* Expressed as rate per 1000. ** Expressed as a percentage.

[11] The conventional rule may be expressed as follows: "A number is rounded off by dropping one or more digits at the right and, if the digit or digits dropped amount to more than one-half of one unit in the final place retained, by increasing the digit in that place by unity." C. H. Forsyth, *An Introduction to the Mathematical Analysis of Statistics* (New York: Wiley, 1924), p. 4. There are certain refinements of this rule which are not relevant here and need not be discussed.

where divisor, dividend, and quotient—all three—were given, so that the accuracy of the operation of division could be examined. Among those cases which could be, and were, checked, the proportion of errors was extraordinarily high. Fully a half of the computations examined were in error. This must be some sort of a record. At least the reviewer has not come across anything like it in a serious scientific report. It seems to reflect gross carelessness and throws some doubt on the validity of the whole study.

Other errors concern canon law, parochial practice, and cognate topics.[12] The Code of Canon Law is cited twice in the book and in both cases the wrong reference is given (pp. 11 and 12). On p. 20 the reader is told that "nominal or dormant Catholics" are "only an indirect responsibility of the priests" and the same viewpoint is expressed several times elsewhere in other language; this seems directly contrary to Canons 464:1 and 467:1. It is stated on p. 44 that "even the least-informed parishioner of St. Mary's knows that by Church precept he must confess his sins once a year." One hopes that there are better informed parishioners who realize that the precept is not as general as this, but binds only those with a mortal sin to confess. Weddings take place at the bride's church, rather than the groom's, not on account of a mere "tradition" as the text implies (p. 103), but by prescription of Canon 1097:2 *nisi iusta causa excuset*. The reader gathers from p. 103 that a quasi-domicile is acquired by six weeks' residence; the correct period is *maior anni pars* (Canon 92:2). Canon Law says nothing about acquiring the right to be married in a parish by living there six weeks. Compare p. 103 of the text with Canon 1097:1,2. One month suffices. Pages 103-4 might give the impression that the Ordinary of "Riverside" is somewhat arbitrary in his attitude on weddings in private homes; Fr. Fichter does not mention that permission for such a wedding can be given *in extraordinario tantum aliquo casu et accedente semper iusta ac rationabili causa* (Canon 1109:2). The discussion on p. 104 overlooks the fact that, in case of adultery, separation by the innocent party does not need permission from the bishop. Contrary to the statement on p. 110, the validation of marriages between Catholics may take place at Mass. It is not a "peculiar cus-

[12] The errors mentioned in this paragraph are cited on the authority of the *Committee Report*.

tom" (p. 148) to have the *Asperges* or *Vidi aquam* before the principal Sunday Mass even when it is not a High Mass; the practice is legal and commendable. On p. 181, footnote, it is incorrectly stated that the Good Friday offerings are "for the decoration and maintenance of the sanctuary"; they are for the Holy Land. Such mistakes, like the computational errors, imply no small degree of carelessness.

Fr. Fichter uses only a very elementary sort of statistical analysis to draw conclusions from his data. His methods call for some discussion. First, let us examine his treatment of the baptisms at "St. Mary's" (pp. 37-39). He reports that in the 20-year period preceding the study there were 4,426 infant baptisms at the church. On the other hand, in his census of the parish, he found only 2,545 persons below the age of twenty—presumably in the group which he classifies as "parishioners."[13] The difference between 4,426 and 2,545 is 1,881 and this figure appears in Table 2 (p. 38) as the total of the column headed "Loss or 'Leakage.'" The reviewer feels that Fr. Fichter has sufficiently well established the fact that a great many baptized Catholics in "St. Mary's" parish do not practice the faith; but he also feels that the results are expressed with a degree of precision not justified by the data. Consider the following recognized convention: "It is a fundamental rule of computation that a result should never be stated to a greater degree of precision than is justified by the data. All superfluous digits are misleading and should be rejected from the result."[14] Fr. Fichter gives the "Percentage Loss" in Table 2 to four significant figures. Is this precision of statement justified? There are five percentages in this "Percentage Loss" column, four for four specific age groups and one for the total loss. Only one of the five percentages is calculated correctly, the other four showing arith-

[13] He reports further that there were 3,540 children of this age group "living in families that listed themselves as Catholics." In the graph on p. 37, the 2,545 and the 3,540 seem to be identified as "Parishioners below 20 years of age" and "Catholics below 20 years of age," respectively. One wonders how Fr. Fichter would account for the difference of 886 between the 4,426 baptisms and the 3,540 "Catholics" below 20. Probably some have died; are the rest apostates? This raises again the question asked in footnote 5, *supra*.

[14] E. V. Huntington in, H. L. Rietz (ed.), *Handbook of Mathematical Statistics* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1924), p. 3.

metical errors; but let us overlook that. The highest age-specific loss is 48.51 in the 15-19 age group. Fr. Fichter entirely overlooks the fact that another parish was cut off from "St. Mary's" in 1931.[15] Many of these teenagers classified as "lost" are doubtless active parishioners of the other parish. The age-specific loss in the 0-4 age group is given as 43.70 (calculational error for 43.73). One wonders in what sense a 4-year-old child can be "lost" to the faith. Are there preschool apostates? Table 2 makes no allowance for children who have died. In the text Fr. Fichter estimates the number of deaths as 265. On p. 39 he gives the percentage loss, with allowance for deaths, as 36.49. If this is the correct figure, why does he give 42.49 (rounding error for 42.50) in Table 2? The most serious criticism of Table 2 is the fact that it does not allow for persons moving in or out of the parish. The assumption that one can calculate "leakage" from the Church by subtracting the number of Catholic children in a specific age group from the number of infant baptisms a corresponding number of years ago is an assumption valid only for a stationary population. There is no reason to believe that the population of "St. Mary's" is of this sort.[16] It is too bad that, instead of using this indirect method, Fr. Fichter did not try to trace the individual children who had been baptized or, at least, an adequate sample of this group, to find what had happened to them. That could be a worthwhile study.

Table 6 on p. 55 deals with confessions. Penitents are classified by frequency of confession as, "Weekly, Monthly, Semiannually, Annually, Never" and the percentage in each category is worked out to three and four significant figures. This table, like some others in the book, offends against the elementary rule of statistics that every individual in the population tabulated should fall unambiguously into one or other of the designated classes. In the present instance where would one put an individual who goes to confession twice a month? He is neither a "Weekly" nor a

[15] *Committee Report.*

[16] Fr. Fichter cites another study of his to prove that the parish "has increased by about five hundred families in the ten years prior to the study" (p. 38). As far as it goes, this is presumptive evidence that his estimated percentage loss is not an overestimate; but this evidence deals with *families* during a *10-year* period and we need *individuals of specific ages* during a *20-year* period.

"Monthly" penitent. Fr. Fichter himself seems to be a bit uneasy about his classification and he writes, "Of course, there may be some parishioners who go to confession three or four times a year, but their numbers are probably small enough to be statistically insignificant." One wonders why. The reviewer cannot understand on what ground the 5,281 Catholic parishioners seven years of age or older are so neatly classified in Table 6 by frequency of confession. The number in the "Never" category is taken from the census; Fr. Fichter's explanation concerning the other categories is not quite satisfying. The chief criticism of Table 6 is that it is a distribution of the confessions (of "St. Mary's" parishioners or others) heard in "St. Mary's" church, and it is not a distribution, as it should be for the purpose, of the confessions of "St. Mary's" parishioners (made at their parish church or elsewhere). Fr. Fichter admits quite frankly on p. 49 that a good many parishioners go to confession elsewhere and that his figures on the number of their confessions need to be "revised upward." It seems extraordinary that, having admitted that his basic data were inaccurate, he goes ahead anyway with Table 6 which certainly has an appearance of great precision.

Chapter 6 is devoted to the reception of Holy Communion. The principal analysis is given in Table 9 on p. 68 where communicants are classified by frequency in the categories, "Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Semiannually, Annually, Never." This table suffers, like Table 6, from defective classification. In which class would a twice-a-week or twice-a-month communicant belong? On p. 68 there is some hint of the way that the numbers in the various categories were obtained. We read, "The totals for the daily, weekly, and monthly communicants are simply the averages of each group as shown above." This probably means that the average number of weekday Communions (excluding First Fridays and holy days) which is given in Table 8 as 73.83 (a calculational error for 73.80) is rounded (incorrectly) to 73 and inserted in Table 9 as the number of daily communicants, and that the average number of Sunday Communions which is given in Table 7 as 492.9 is rounded (incorrectly) to 492 and inserted in Table 9 as the number of weekly communicants. The number of monthly communicants in Table 9, namely, 646, looks like the average number of First Friday Communions in the graph on p. 65. If this is the

justification for the figures in Table 9, it is a bit amazing. For example, what reason is there to think that the number of weekly communicants equals the average number of Communions distributed on Sunday? Presumably, a good many monthly communicants also go to Communion on Sunday, for instance at the Communion Mass of their parish organization (pp. 142-43). Table 9 also tacitly implies that the number of "St. Mary's" parishioners receiving Communion elsewhere exactly balances the number from other parishes receiving Communion at this church; no evidence is given that this is true. Finally, one must recall that Fr. Fichter's figure for the total number of Communions distributed during the year (59,524) differs widely from the figure (83,000) given in the official report from the parish and it is by no means clear that the latter figure is wrong.

One of the more sensational statements of the book, and one of the more questionable, occurs on p. 153. "We have estimated that only 57.43 per cent of those who ought to go to Sunday Mass actually do so." As the statement stands, it would seem to refer to the common, ordinary, habitual practice of the parishioners. This is not the case. The estimate is based on the Mass attendance on "a bitterly cold day for this southern city" (pp. 151-52), the Sunday with the year's lowest attendance, 2,758. To this figure Fr. Fichter says he has added 10 per cent "to account for those who fulfil their obligation at other churches and for those who may have legitimate excuses." Ten per cent of 2,758 is 275.8. Fr. Fichter rounds this (incorrectly) to 275, adds this to 2,758, and obtains 3,033. This is 57.43 per cent of 5,281, the number of parishioners "of seven years of age and older, who are bound by the obligation of attending Mass." It should be obvious that, from the actual attendance at the parish church, one cannot estimate the number of parishioners who "ought to go to Sunday Mass" and the number who "actually do so" without knowing, in addition, (1) the number from "St. Mary's" attending Mass elsewhere, (2) the number of non-parishioners attending Mass at "St. Mary's," and (3) the number of parishioners with legitimate excuses. On (1) and (2) no adequate data are presented.[17] To estimate (3) is

[17] It is stated on p. 21 that "in 21.8 per cent of the parish households one or more persons attended Sunday Mass regularly at some other parish church." From this statement about *households* one cannot infer the actual

still more difficult. One would have to apply moral theology to the particular circumstances of every parishioner who did not show up for Mass on the "bitterly cold" sample Sunday. Since it obviously lacks an adequate basis, Fr. Fichter's estimate that "only 57.43 per cent of those who ought to go to Sunday Mass actually do so" is little more than a guess. The corresponding figure based on the responses of the parishioners themselves to the census was 81.29 per cent (p. 153). The reviewer can see no real proof that this figure is any farther from the truth than Fr. Fichter's estimate.[18]

Chapter 20, "The Catholic Mind of the Parish," is probably the weakest chapter in the book. It describes an original test of 16 items which was given to a sample of 40 men and 28 women drawn in some unspecified way from a universe described as "the inner circle of the people of St. Mary's" (p. 260). The standard requisites for scientific test construction, even a discussion of reliability and validity, are wholly lacking. Some of the questions are very

---

number of *persons* who attend Sunday Mass regularly elsewhere and it gives no information about those who attend elsewhere *irregularly*.

[18] In a letter in *Commonweal*, LV (Jan. 4, 1952), 329, the present writer called attention to an apparent discrepancy on p. 152. The total Sunday Mass attendance for the survey year as calculated from Table 16 on that page is 171,399; but the total Sunday Mass attendance as calculated by multiplying the average Sunday attendance (given also on p. 152) by the number of Sundays in the survey year is 183,645. In a personal communication Fr. Fichter has explained that, while the first of these figures "refers only to persons seven years of age and older," the second refers to "every man, woman and child who attended Sunday Mass." This is a perfectly satisfying explanation—but it is hardly one that could be guessed from reading the text. It is clear enough, from the text of p. 152, that the figures in Table 16 refer only to the group of parishioners seven years of age and older; but Fr. Fichter goes on without a break to give the maximum, minimum, and average Sunday Mass attendance and there is nothing to indicate that these figures refer to a different group, namely, one that includes infants and preschool children. That only one group is involved seems particularly clear when one reads the next page (p. 153) and finds that Fr. Fichter has used the minimum attendance figure which he just gave to calculate a quantity which enters into Table 16. Would it occur to the reader that he would use the count of a group which *included* infants and preschool children to estimate the attendance of a group which *excluded* infants and preschool children?

strange. To obtain credit on no. 16 one must answer "Yes" to the question, "Do you think that the laws of fast and abstinence as promulgated in this diocese ought to be made more strict" and thus disagree with the Bishop. To obtain credit on no. 5 one must answer "Yes" to the question, "If you wanted to send your child to a public school, would you bother to ask the permission of the Bishop?" although the Ordinary of "Riverside" who, by Canon 1374, has the power to regulate the matter does not require or expect applications for permission in individual cases.[19] The persons who were given this very questionable test made an average score of 56.98 (p. 270). On this flimsy basis—after a certain amount of hesitation, it is true—Fr. Fichter finally reaches the conclusion that "they are somewhat better than 'half-Catholic' in their thinking" (p. 270). This seems a rather bold conclusion.

All in all, *Southern Parish* is a disappointing book. It does indeed give a very lively running account of what went on in a city church from one end of the year to the other—but the incidents of urban parish life are already perfectly familiar to millions of American Catholics. It does indeed give figures on the religious observance of parishioners worked out to three and four significant digits—but such precision of statement was certainly not justified by the data. It does indeed focus attention on the importance of the sociological study of parish life —but research in this field is by no means a novelty and an impressive number of good scientific studies have appeared in the course of the last decade.[20] The author of *Southern Parish* is a man of outstanding ability and he has had excellent training. He was assisted by grants-in-aid and had a field staff of ten lay people and six priests. Under the circumstances it is not quite easy to understand why his study added so little to what was already known about the sociology of the parish.

PAUL HANLY FURFEY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[19] *Committee Report.*

[20] There is a good summary of such studies in. C. J. Nuesse and Thomas J. Harte (eds.), *The Sociology of the Parish* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1951). See particularly the studies of religious observance summarized on pp. 212-14.

CHALCEDON, ST. THOMAS AQUINAS, AND THE CONCEPT OF PERSON[1]

On June 13, 449, Pope Leo the Great sent his well known dogmatic letter or tome to Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople. In this letter occurs the sentence: "The Catholic Church lives and grows in the faith that in Christ Jesus there was neither humanity without true divinity nor divinity without true humanity." When the letter was read at the second session of the Council of Chalcedon, on Oct. 10, 451, the assembled bishops exclaimed, "That is the faith of the Fathers; that is the faith of the apostles. . . . Peter has spoken by Leo: thus Cyril taught."

On Oct. 22, 451, the Council in its decree concerning the Faith rejected the teaching of Eutyches to the effect that before the union of God and man in Christ there were two natures, divine and human, of Our Lord, but after the union only one. Eutyches never satisfactorily explained what he meant by this. The Council simply affirmed that in the one person of Christ there were two distinct natures, divinity and humanity, each with its own properties, without confusion and yet without separation.

By these affirmations the Church marked its refusal to measure a revealed truth according to a purely human standard. It is true, we always find in our experience a numerical correspondence between person and nature. Each person has his own individual nature; and no one really has a double nature, even though at times we may use this figurative expression. In the order of concrete existing reality in which we live there is a one-for-one correspondence between nature and person. For this reason the terms nature, person, and hypostasis were often used interchangeably in the past. A movement arose in the fourth century that in effect attempted to fit the Incarnation into the framework of nature and person as they are related in our purely human experience. This movement branched out into two opposite heresies, both of which started from the same underlying principle.

[1] What follows is a contribution to a symposium held at Columbia University, New York, on Nov. 13, 1951, to commemorate the fifteenth-hundred anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon.

The first of these manifestations of a purely human standard of judgment applied to the Incarnation is known as Monophysitism. The first Monophysite, however, was not Eutyches but Apollinaris the Younger of Laodicea. In the second half of the fourth century he manifested how fundamental in his thinking was the principle of a numerical correspondence between nature and person. The only nature in Christ was the divine nature which corresponded with his divine personality. Apollinaris refused to admit that the body and soul assumed by the Son of God in the Incarnation constituted a genuine human nature. In order to make sure that the body and soul of Christ have no right to be called a human nature, he deprived the soul of Christ of mind and will and assigned these functions to the Word of God.

Nestorius reacted strongly against this teaching of Apollinaris. His doctrine of two natures and two persons in Christ seems to be diametrically opposed to the Monophysitism of the Laodicean bishop, yet he was assuming the same principle of a numerical correspondence between person and nature that underlies the Apollinarian doctrine. The only difference lies in the starting point. For Nestorius the duality of natures in Christ is incontestable; it follows then as a matter of course that there must also be two corresponding persons.

The recoil against the teaching of Nestorius was extreme in the case of Eutyches. Firmly convinced of the unity of person in Christ, he could not see how this could be expressed in any other way than by asserting the unity of his nature. This meant for Eutyches the absorption of the human nature by the divine after the union of God and man in Christ. Again we are witnessing the phenomenon of two opponents in doctrine reaching opposite conclusions, yet having the same principle in common. If there must be a numerical correspondence between person and nature, then Eutyches is consistent enough in asserting the unity of nature in Christ, granting the unity of his person. At the same time Nestorius is equally consistent in his assertion of the duality of persons, granting the duality of natures.

To the Council of Chalcedon belongs the lasting credit of challenging the fundamental assumption underlying all these disputes. The conclusion we arrive at by induction from observing cases that come within our experience cannot be used as a yardstick

with which to measure a case that is not merely human. It may be true that we always find a numerical correspondence between person and individual nature, but we learn about Christ not from our limited observation but from the teaching of the Church with its roots in the Scriptures and in the traditions preserved by the Fathers. Revelation makes known that the one person whom the apostles saw and conversed with was more than merely human; he was, in the words of Thomas, their Lord and their God. We must then make an exception to the rule of a one-for-one correspondence between nature and person and in this case assert that two natures, divinity and humanity, were present in the one person of the Son of God.

The Council was not primarily concerned with definitions of terms but with safeguarding the truth that the one Christ is both God and man. This truth is sufficiently safeguarded when it is expressed in terms of unity of person and duality of nature. Before the Council, it is true, the terms nature, person, and hypostasis were often used indiscriminately. This inevitably led to a certain vagueness and uncertainty as to their precise meaning. The Council put an end to this indiscriminate usage, at least in regard to the expression of the basic truth of the Incarnation. One person and two natures is now the orthodox way of stating the doctrine held from the beginning that Christ is true God and true man.

For those who refused to accept the Council of Chalcedon, the terms nature, person, and hypostasis continued to be used synonymously. The result was inevitable. Without the safeguard of a clear, consistent, and unambiguous terminology the theology of the Incarnation grew more and more at variance with the theology of the Trinity. If nature, person, and hypostasis are synonymous, what becomes of the doctrine of the Trinity, where nature is one and the persons three? The leading Monophysite theologian of the sixth century, Severus of Antioch, tells us in reply: nature and person (hypostasis) are not the same in the theology (that is, in the Trinity), but they are the same in the economy (that is, in the Incarnation).[2] Other Monophysites were more consistent and carried the equivalence of nature and person even into the Trinity.

[2] Cf. M. Jugie, "Monophysisme Severien," *D.T.C.*, X, 2222.

They gave at least the appearance of tritheism by their one-for-one correspondence of the divine nature with each of the three divine persons.

We learn from St. Thomas Aquinas that the same identification of nature and hypostasis was made even by some theological writers of the West in the twelfth century. Because the human nature of Christ was not an abstraction but an individual, concrete substance, they called it an hypostasis or supposit and did not hesitate to speak of two hypostases in the one person of Christ. These notions and terminology were congenial to theologians of the school of Abelard.[3] For St. Thomas, all this looks suspiciously like the one moral person of Nestorius serving as a mask to link in the bond of love and friendship two real and distinct persons.

St. Thomas was mainly concerned to keep distinct what the Council of Chalcedon kept distinct: nature on the one hand and person or hypostasis on the other. As a theologian he could do what it was not the business of the Council to do. He drew up a list of terms with a precise meaning attached to each of them. A good example of this properly theological method is to be found in *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 2, a. 2. After citing the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon in the *Sed contra* he gives us in the body of the article his understanding of what the terms involved in this issue really mean.

Nature for St. Thomas is an essential term; it is that which a definition reveals. Nature is not the subject that exists; it is rather the part or principle in a subject which determines it specifically to be this or that kind of being. Person on the other hand is an existential term. It points to the individual subject which as a whole enjoys independent existence. If this subject does not possess a rational nature St. Thomas gives it the generic name of hypostasis or supposit. The term person is a name of dignity; it is reserved for subjects that possess substantial existence and which exist on the highest level, the level of intelligence and freedom. It is impossible to change nature into person by the mere addition of individuality. The attempt to do so manifests an essentialist mentality which is part of the legacy left by Platonism to

[3] See *In III Sent.*, d. 6, q. 1, a. 1; *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 2, a. 3; *Contra Gent.*, IV, 38, 39.

generations of thinkers and writers even within the Church. Person, however, and nature are in different orders of reality; since person is the subject that exists, while nature is a principle of specification within an existing subject.

In the Incarnation the only existing subject was the Word of God made flesh. There was no other subject enjoying independent existence. The body and soul of Christ were real; they were an individual, complete human nature, but there was no corresponding human subject or person to possess them. They were possessed and sustained in being by the person of the Word.

St. Thomas' notions on nature and person mark an advance upon the use of these terms before and even after the Council of Chalcedon. In the light of his definitions and explanations we now can understand the confusion that resulted from permitting an essential term like nature to stand for that most existential of all realities, a person. St. Cyril of Alexandria, champion though he was of the orthodox cause, was guilty to some extent of this platonic sin, as well as the Eutychians and all those who made nature, person, and hypostasis purely synonymous terms. We should not perhaps blame them too much for not being wiser than their generation. At any rate, the Council of Chalcedon, by its refusal to subscribe to the principle of a one-for-one correspondence between person and nature at least in the case of Christ our Lord, paved the way for an existentialist notion of personality, with its dynamic implications, that is seen at its best in the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas. For one who grasps this notion it is no longer possible to identify a person with a sufficiently individualized essence or nature.

Clearness and precision, however, are not always welcomed as adjuncts and aids in theological discussions. The contention has even been made that concepts such as person and nature should be kept fluid if they are not to mislead, with the implied reproach that theologians have done a disservice to the Faith by attempting to define accurately the terms they were using.[4] Yet does not the

[4] As an example of this mentality the following could hardly be improved upon: "Concepts such as person and nature must be kept fluid, if they are not to mislead. If they are made into hard and fast ideas, into sharply defined abstractions, they will be taken to represent discrete psychic entities, external to one another as numbers are. . . . The intellectual training that makes men acute logicians disqualifies them for dealing with the living

story of Chalcedon and its aftermath show us how difficult it is to keep intact a revealed doctrine such as the Incarnation when the language used to express it is vague, ambiguous, and imprecise?

Accuracy and precision in thought and terminology grow with the advance of science, and the science of theology is no exception to the rule. Newman once remarked that when the terms hypostasis, ousia, and the like, were used in a definite sense, that is, scientifically, in Christian teaching, they became the protection and record of orthodoxy.[5] Is not this the same lesson St. Paul taught to Timothy when he said: "Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus"?[6]

The Council of Chalcedon was simply carrying out this injunction when it defined the two natures in the one person of Christ our Lord. Theologians in the East and in the West who have held fast to the sound words and formulas of Chalcedon have preserved the revealed truth that Christ is both God and man. At the same time they are mindful of the words of St. Peter,[7] and by their explanations and definitions they have attempted to give a reason for the hope that is in them.

WILLIAM R. O'CONNOR

St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie
Yonkers, N. Y.

subject. The monophysite Christologians were subtle dialecticians, but the psychology of Christ's being lay outside their competence." This is taken from the anti-monophysite study, *Monophysitism Past and Present*, by A. A. Luce (London: S.P.C.K., 1920).

[5] "St. Cyril's formula, *μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη*," *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), p. 338.

[6] *II Tim.* 1:13.

[7] *I Peter*, 3:15: "But sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts, being ready always to satisfy everyone that asketh you a reason of the hope which is in you."

"MONSTRA TE ESSE MATREM"

The spiritual maternity of the Blessed Virgin has been brought to the professional attention of American theologians by the recent publication of Volume III of *Marian Studies* by the Mariological Society of America. In investigating the exact meaning, the basis, and the consequences of a doctrine still under discussion, a careful review of the writings and practice of the past is necessary. When we study the development of the doctrine of Mary's spiritual motherhood of men, the words "*Monstra te esse matrem:* Show thyself our mother," immediately come to mind (Cf. *Marian Studies,* III, 154). As the hymn *Ave Maris Stella,* where these words occur, is found in a Saint Gall manuscript of the ninth century, such an explicit reference to Mary as our mother would indicate an unexpectedly early appearance of the doctrine. The Latin text is, however, not as explicit as the English translation, and a careful checking of the context is necessary before the text can be used as evidence.

The immediate context seems rather favorable to the interpretation given in the English translation above, for the preceding line reads, "*Bona cuncta posce:* Ask all good things for us," and the following line takes up the same idea of intercession, "*Sumat per te preces:* May he receive through thee our prayers." This could point to Mary's spiritual motherhood, for this motherhood is usually taken as as a kind of summary both of her co-operation in the work of our redemption during Christ's earthly life and of the part she takes as Mediatrix of Graces in bringing the fruits of this redemption to us today. Her function as Mediatrix is at least in part synonymous with her universal intercession. Hence, asking her to obtain all good things for us, and asking that Christ may receive our prayers through her, would be synonymous with asking her to carry out her maternal function in our regard, to show herself our mother. The context seems therefore to allow the interpretation, "Show thyself *our* mother."

Yet, the reader will already have remarked that the line, "May he receive through thee our prayers," in the third person, is rather far removed in viewpoint from the idea of, "Show thyself our mother," in the second person. The two can be brought into line

only by a good deal of emphasis and mental juggling of the words "through thee." Plainly, a close analysis of the whole stanza is imperative. Has it any unity, and if it has, what is its basic idea?

The whole stanza reads :

Monstra te esse matrem	Show thyself (a? the? our?) mother.
Sumat per te preces	Through thee may he receive our prayers,
Qui pro nobis natus	Who being born for us,
Tulit esse tuus.	Didst will to be thy son.

There are two verbs here, an imperative, *Monstra:* show, and a wish in the subjunctive, *Sumat:* may he receive. They should express the ideas of the stanza, and they do. But the relation between the two is not indicated. Are they successive and independent, or are they parallel and synonymous? The word *mother* following the first verb, and the words *born* and *son* following the other, tend to make the two parts parallel and synonymous, so that the idea of the first line can be taken as repeated and made clear with additional details in the three other lines. The thought would then read in paraphrase: "Show that you are the mother of Jesus, that you have a mother's power, by getting our prayers accepted by him who in becoming man for us was willing to become your son." Might there not be an allusion here to III *Kings* 2:20: "And the king (Solomon) said to her: My mother, ask: for I must not turn away thy face"? In any case, the thought of the stanza is thus unified and clear. On the other hand, the rest of the stanza has nothing in it to suggest that the author was thinking of Mary as Mother of Men when he wrote the words, "*Monstra te esse matrem,*" for the other lines indicate that he was thinking of Mary as Mother of God. As all the other stanzas are closely knit together, we cannot suppose that one line here could have a meaning with no bearing on the other lines of the same stanza.

This impression must, however, be checked with the context of the whole poem. Perhaps this has not been done because the whole poem seems at first reading to be without any definite order. Yet, further reading will reveal that several factors set off the first stanza from the rest of the poem, excepting of course the last stanza, which in hymns is always a praise or doxology of the Trinity: (1) The first stanza is a crazy quilt of unconnected titles,

whereas each other stanza has unity. (2) The first stanza is the only one that contains no petition, or that contains no *we* or *us* in the second half. (3) While there is no rhyme in the Latin, there are many resemblances of vowel or consonant sounds at the ends of lines, which seem to weave the stanzas together. In this regard the first stanza again stands alone with its triple *a*, while the others are grouped into pairs of stanzas: stanzas 2 and 3 by the *e* of their last two lines; 4 and 5 by the *us* and *os* of their last two lines, not to speak of all the other *s's;* 6 and 7 by the recurring *u* of their final syllables. Now, the use of an introductory stanza distinct from the others, which then go on in pairs, is not found in hymns; it is a characteristic of earlier sequences. The *Victimae Paschali* is the only example still remaining in the Missal.

In the *Ave Maris Stella* that we are considering, the introductory stanza is, however, more than an opening invocation; it is an overture containing the key-ideas of the whole poem. In fact the five elements of this first stanza are assigned successively as topics to the next five stanzas:

1 Ave, maris stell*a*,	Hail, star of the sea,
Dei Mater alm*a*,	loving Mother of God,
Atque semper Virgo,	and ever Virgin,
Felix caeli port*a*,	happy gate of heaven!
Ave	*Hail*
2 Sumens illud Av*e*	Receiving that "Hail!"
Gabrielis or*e*,	from Gabriel's mouth,
Funda nos in pac*e*,	establish us in peace,
Mutans Evae nom*en*.	changing Eva's name.
Maris stella	*Star of the Sea*
3 Solve vincla reis,	Loose the chains for sinners,
Profer lumen caecis,	give light to the blind,
Mala nostra pell*e*,	drive away our evils,
Bona cuncta posc*e*.	ask for all good things.
Dei Mater alma	*Loving Mother of God*
4 Monstra te esse matrem,	Show thyself to be a mother:
Sumat per te preces,	through thee may our prayers be
Qui pro nobis nat*us*,	received by him who, born for us,
Tulit esse tu*us*.	willed to be thy (Son).
Atque semper Virgo	*And ever Virgin*

5 Virgo singularis,	O incomparable Virgin,
Inter omnes mitis,	meek above all others,
Nos, culpis solut*os*,	make us, freed from sin,
Mites fac et cast*os*.	meek and chaste.
Felix caeli porta	*Happy gate of heaven*
6 Vitam praesta puram,	Grant us a pure life,
Iter para tutum,	make safe our way,
Ut, videntes Jes*u*m,	so that, seeing Jesus,
Semper collaetem*u*r.	we may rejoice together forever.
7 Sit laus Deo Patri,	To God the Father be praise,
Summo Christo dec*u*s,	To Christ most high, glory,
Spiritui Sancto,	(and) to the Holy Ghost:
Tribus honor un*u*s.	to the three be one honor.
Amen.	Amen.

The fourth stanza may now be interpreted in the light of the context of the whole poem, for it is the development of the topic-phrase *"Dei Mater alma:* Loving Mother of God," found in the introductory stanza. The preceding stanza finishes with *"Bona cuncta posce:* Ask all good things for us." Keeping this in mind—for the idea of prayer comes back explicitly a line further down—we must take *"Monstra te esse matrem"* in the sense of "Show thyself the Mother of God by using thy power and obtaining all good things for us." At the head of the stanza this is a further urgent request containing the topic-word, almost putting Mary to the test, and introducing a confident wish that her prayer for us will be heard: *"Sumat per te preces . . .* : Through thee may our prayers be received by him who, born for us, willed to be thy son." Repetition, insistence, pleading with Mary to use her powers as mother, such is the burden of this part of the poem, and the line, "Show thyself a mother," is part of its expression.

This absence of direct allusion to Mary as Mother of Men is confirmed by the anthem *Alma Redemptoris Mater,* which is a rather close parallel of the *Ave Maris Stella,* probably even a summary of it in more difficult rhythm. In this anthem the author hails Mary as Mother of God in most explicit and glorious terms: "Alma Redemptoris Mater . . . Tu quae genuisti, natura mirante, tuum sanctum Genitorem: Beloved Mother of the Redeemer . . .

To the surprise of all nature, thou didst bring forth in this world thine all-holy Creator." The author touches all the five elements of the *Ave Maris Stella* but makes no allusion whatever to Mary as Mother of Men. If he had thought this was another element of the hymn, it is unlikely that he would have omitted using it also. These texts suggest, indeed, that in those times the Blessed Virgin Mary was simply not addressed as Mother of Men in an explicit way, for even in the *Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy*, the word *mother* is a later addition; the manuscripts give, "Hail, Queen of Mercy: *Salve, Regina misericordiae.*"

The words *"Monstra te esse matrem"* contain therefore no explicit allusion to the spiritual motherhood of the Blessed Virgin and cannot be used as a proof for the early appearance of this particular belief in Christian consciousness.

Hence, too, in saying the words "Show thyself a mother" we should first of all do as their author did and turn our thoughts to the Mother of God in the sublime grace and supreme power of intercession which that dignity confers upon her. Nothing prevents us from recalling at the same time what we know more explicitly today, namely, that she has helped and continues to help in obtaining for us an ever-growing share in the divine life of grace, and that she is consequently our mother in the supernatural order. This thought would enrich the latter part of the stanza without changing the author's meaning in the first line, for it would make our title to Mary's intercession more explicit and our request more appealing: We are not asking her simply to intercede for a suppliant who happens to ask her help; we are linked to her as children to their mother; we are asking her to carry out her role towards all of us and to become more and more our spiritual mother by procuring us an increase of divine life, which is the best of "all the good things" that we want her to ask for in our behalf.

CHARLES DREISOERNER, S.M.

St. Mary's University
San Antonio, Texas

EXTREME UNCTION: A PASTORAL BRIEF

How sick does one have to be in order to receive Extreme Unction?

Canon 940 states that Extreme Unction can be given only to a Catholic who, after having attained the use of reason, is in danger of death through sickness or old age. In the same illness this sacrament cannot be repeated unless the sick person rallies after the reception of the last anointing and his illness again becomes critical.

The sickness, therefore, must be so serious that the sick person is in danger of death.

Now to answer the initial question very thoroughly, we proceed to ask and answer the following:

Is it necessary that the danger be proximate, or most serious, or very serious? No, none of these.

Is it required and sufficient that the danger of death be morally *probable*, i.e. probable without being completely demonstrable? Yes.

Is it always required and necessary that the danger of death be considered probable by a doctor, or by the sick person, or his family, or by people in general? No.

Is the prudent judgment of one person sufficient? Yes.

Is the sacrament administered validly as often as the sickness is dangerous and serious, even if one does not give any thought to the stage of the disease? Yes.

Is the sacrament administered validly and licitly when in doubt whether there is really a danger of death or not, whether it is probable or grave or not? Yes.

May Extreme Unction be validly and licitly administered to a person who is in danger of death because of old age? Yes.

May Extreme Unction be given if the illness is light but there is fear that it may become dangerous? No.

If the illness appears light to the doctor or to others but does as a matter of fact gravely afflict the sick person, who considers himself in danger of death and asks for Extreme Unction, may it be validly and licitly administered? Yes.

If the doctor or the pastor or some other prudent person thinks that the sick person is in danger of death, but the sick person himself considers the disease to be light, may Extreme Unction be administered? Yes.

If the disease only lightly afflicts the sick person but is in reality dangerous, may the sacrament be administered? Yes.

If the illness seems to be serious and dangerous, that is, when there is a real sickness and it has been prudently considered as serious and dangerous, but in reality there is no danger of death, may Extreme Unction be administered? Yes.

If a person would make believe that he is seriously ill whereas he is not, could Extreme Unction be validly and licitly received? No.

If a person were most imprudently considered seriously ill when as a matter of fact there were really no illness at all or only a light illness, could he receive Extreme Unction? No.

If a person is gravely afflicted with a disease which of its very nature is indeed dangerous but does not yet seem to endanger life, may Extreme Unction be administered? Yes.

If the nature of the illness is not known and there is a prudent doubt whether it is serious and dangerous or not, may Extreme Unction be administered? Yes.

Can Extreme Unction be validly administered to a person who has an illness that carries with it a sure danger of death, but a remote danger, as in the case of a patient with tuberculosis of whom it can be foreseen that, unless something unexpected happens, he will live for many months? Yes.

If from the circumstances there is reason to fear that such a patient as just mentioned might later on not have a chance to receive Extreme Unction, may it and should it be administered? Yes.

If a person is suffering from a serious and dangerous disease, and skilled doctors declare that all danger can be removed if the patient undergoes an operation and the patient refuses to have the operation, may Extreme Unction be administered? Yes.

If the patient just mentioned, thus suffering from a serious and dangerous disease, agrees to undergo the operation, may he receive Extreme Unction before the operation? Yes.

If the surgical operation itself is dangerous, as is frequently the case, may Extreme Unction be validly and licitly administered to

this sick and suffering patient who has a serious and dangerous disease—in other words, is there not all the more reason then to administer the sacrament before the operation? Yes.

Suppose one doubts whether the sick person is really in danger of death. May Extreme Unction then be administered?

Canon 941 says that when one doubts whether the sick person has attained the use of reason, whether he is really in danger of death, or whether he is dead, Extreme Unction shall be given conditionally.

Canon 942 says that this sacrament is not to be administered to those who obstinately and impenitently persevere in open mortal sin; if this is doubtful, they may be anointed conditionally.

Canon 943 says that sick persons who, while they were still conscious, asked for the sacrament at least implicitly, or who very likely would have asked for it, may be anointed absolutely though they have lost consciousness or the use of reason.

The above excerpts contain the answer to the question. But, to reply to other queries that might come to mind, we proceed to ask and answer the following:

May Extreme Unction be repeated if it is certain that the same danger of death continues? No.

May it be given again if there is a prudent doubt whether the sick person, in the same sickness, has gotten out of the danger of death and has then fallen into another danger of death? Yes.

May it be repeated if a person received it in danger of death from one disease and then fell into danger of death from another disease that developed after cessation of danger from the first one? Yes.

When in doubt as to whether there is a new danger of death, should one decide in favor of a repetition of the sacrament? Yes.

If the danger of death is increased by the addition of a new disease, or if the moment of death comes, may the sacrament be repeated? No.

If the patient falls into a new and distinct danger of death, even in the same illness, may Extreme Unction be repeated? Yes.

May it in the case just mentioned be repeated irrespective of the length of time from the former anointing as well as irrespective of whether there is or is not a new illness? Yes.

When there is a doubt whether, in the same illness, a patient has recovered from a former and fallen into a new danger, may the sacrament be repeated? Yes.

In case of a doubt like the one just mentioned, *in a lingering illness*, when there is no certain evidence that the patient has recovered from a former and fallen into a new danger, may the lapse of about a month from the former anointing be taken in practice as giving rise to the presumption that the former danger has passed and that a new and distinct danger has supervened and that the patient may be anointed again? Yes.

Must the sacrament of Extreme Unction be repeated if the sick person recovers from one dangerous illness and then falls into another dangerous illness? Yes.

Must the sacrament ordinarily be given again if in the same illness the sick person certainly recovered from the danger of death but then fell into another danger of death? Yes.

If a sick person was in probable danger of death and received Extreme Unction and then got somewhat better and remained so for a longer time, so that the danger of death became improbable or light or entirely disappeared, and then he again fell into probable danger of death, may Extreme Unction be repeated? Yes.

Is it true that it is by far the more common and more probable opinion (but not certain) that Extreme Unction cannot be validly repeated in the same illness and in the same danger of death? Yes.

Should Extreme Unction be administered to one who has just died, as long as there is no certain sign of death, that is, as long as it is probable that there is still life in him and it can be presumed that he has the intention of receiving this sacrament? Yes.

Is it true that such a one apparently dead may be anointed up to about half an hour from the moment when he seemed to be dead if he died of a lingering disease, and up to an hour or maybe two hours or more if he died a sudden death or a sudden death after a lingering illness, provided that in the meantime no sure sign of death has appeared? Yes.

Is it true that in this case of one apparently dead the sacrament should be given conditionally, namely "If you are living," and that it is given with a single anointing on the forehead, without adding or supplying anything? Yes.

Is it true that Extreme Unction may never be given to the dead, and that it were well to explain this to those who are around and who may not understand? Yes.

Is it true that this sacrament should not be deferred until death seems to be imminent because the dying person can not at all or only in a very imperfect way co-operate with the graces of the sacrament, since often he no longer has sufficient mental powers to elicit an act of sorrow, confidence in the mercy of God, resignation to the will of God, and also because there can then be no restoration to health, which God might grant if it should be for the welfare of the soul, and finally because then the principal effect of the sacrament, namely the *confortatio animi,* the comforting of the soul, would be rendered altogether or almost null? Yes.

May Extreme Unction be administered conditionally (*si capax es,* if you are able) to the insane who have lost the use of reason once they had attained it, provided they are sick and in danger of death? Yes.

May this conditional Extreme Unction be given to the insane mentioned, even if they have no lucid intervals? Yes.

Is it true that because the insane and the unconscious cannot have any apparent devotion, and because any irreverence is merely material and does not impede the fruit of the sacrament and can be obviated in various ways, Extreme Unction may also be *lawfully* administered to the insane who are sick and in danger of death? Yes.

May the tossing or unruly insane who are sick and in danger of death be anointed with a single unction on the forehead? Yes.

In the case of the insane, is the intention of receiving Extreme Unction implied in the general will which a man has, and has not retracted, of making use of the means which have been ordained by Christ for salvation? Yes.

We know that Christ does not will to sanctify adults without their wish and consent, but that an habitual intention is sufficient, even implicit. For, to receive a gift and benefit, no other intention except a free acceptance or removal of the contrary will is required, and a free acceptance is contained in the habitual will. (Cf. Noldin, III, 38). A free acceptance is contained in an habitual intention, which is one that once actually existed, but of the present continuance of which there is no positive trace, the most that can be said

of it being that it has never been retracted. All this being presumed, is it true that to receive Confirmation, Extreme Unction, Communion (cf. Hervé, 514; Cappello, I, 74), Penance at the hour of death, and more probably Baptism too, an habitual *implicit* intention suffices, namely one which is contained in a general and direct intention of receiving the means of salvation when the time comes, or in the will of living and dying as a Christian? Yes.

Is it true that infants who have not reached the use of reason and insane persons who were always insane, who never had the use of reason, are quite incapable of receiving the sacrament of Extreme Unction? Yes.

Is it true that in the following cases Extreme Unction may be administered conditionally: if in doubt whether the infirm is (1) living or dead, (2) baptized or not, a Catholic, heretic or schismatic, (3) already received Extreme Unction in the same danger of death, (4) is really in danger of death, (5) has received the sacrament validly or not, (6) is rightly disposed or not, (7) has attained the use of reason or not? Yes.

The condition would be expressed by the words: "If you are living," "If you are capable." In practice Extreme Unction should never be administered with the condition: "If you are disposed," for if this condition is placed and the subject is really indisposed, even without any fault on his part, the sacrament is rendered null, so that if later on the sick person should have the proper dispositions he would nevertheless not obtain the fruit of this salutary sacrament.

(The above answers for the most part were given after carefully consulting Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, Vol. III, edition of 1942, the whole of which volume of 266 pages treats of Extreme Unction.)

WINFRID HERBST, S.D.S.

Salvatorian Seminary
St. Nazianz, Wisconsin

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

The field of special education is defined as the educational program which is planned by private or public agencies for the education of exceptional children. Exceptional children are generally defined as "children who deviate from the normal child physically, mentally, emotionally or socially to such an extent that specialized services are essential to provide an adequate educational program." Since we lack trained teachers and special classes for exceptional children in our parochial schools throughout the country, Catholic children are forced into the public schools or into state institutions. Greater efforts should be made in the parochial school system to care for exceptional children. Don Sharkey writes in *These Young Lives:* "Much more remains to be done, but progress is being made toward providing a Christian education for *all* of God's children."[1]

The Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. has taken the lead in training teachers for the atypical child. In the summer session of 1951 twenty religious orders from twenty-five dioceses were represented in the "Institute for the Preparation of Teachers of Sight Saving Classes and Teachers of Braille Classes." Prior to the opening of the summer session in 1952 at The Catholic University of America, a "Workshop in Special Education" covering the various groups of exceptional children was held from June 13 to June 24. Lectures and consultations were held on the mentally retarded; socially maladjusted; blind and partially seeing; deaf and hard-of-hearing; gifted; children with lowered vitality; speech correction; crippled; remedial reading; tests and measurements, and other phases of special education.

If every Catholic child is entitled to a Catholic school education, then our parochial schools must be equipped to meet the problems created by the vast array of individual differences. The parochial schools have done an exceptional job in educating normal children. Let us hope that they will soon do a normal job in educating exceptional children. Every pupil is unique, and

[1] Don Sharkey, *These Young Lives* (New York: W. H. Sadlier, Inc., 1950), p. 73.

those who deviate most markedly from the mental, social and physical norms must be given a special type of education. The fact that the exceptional child, by definition, deviates so far from the normal, makes it obvious that many difficulties will be encountered in attempting to teach him in a regular class group. Hence, we see the great, imperative and immediate need for special classes and certified trained teachers of exceptional children in our parochial schools, if we are to "provide a Christian education for *all* of God's children."[2]

Medical science can do far more with the so-called "wonder drugs" for defective vision than it could a generation ago. Still we have a 17% increase in blindness due to hereditary or congenital causes. Fifty percent blindness can be prevented with our present medical knowledge, but greater use of preventive measures must be used. Vision tests and the necessary "follow-up" procedure should be conscientiously employed in our Catholic schools. Children with 20/70 vision and children with progressive eye difficulties should be placed in a sight conservation class under a trained teacher upon the recommendations of the ophthalmologist. Large print books of 18 and 24 point type; special lighting; movable desks and other features will prevent eye strain and save whatever vision these children now have. To allow these children to use the materials of normal children will hasten blindness.

Our parochial schools today are not equipped to care for the atypical child. We have only two sight conservation classes in the entire parochial school system, and Catholic children with visual difficulties are forced to attend the public schools or go to state institutions. Closing the doors of the parochial school to children with poor vision does not solve our problem. We still need trained teachers to instruct these children in religion.

Even this phase of the work has been sadly neglected; namely, the printing of books in large print and in Braille for instructing our Catholic children in their holy faith. We have no Braille classes for the blind children in our parochial schools, and only three Catholic schools for the blind in the country—all east of the Mississippi. Consequently, our blind and partially seeing Catholic children are banished to the wastelands of an irreligious education

[2] *Ibid.*

either in the public schools or in state institutions, with no provision made for their transportation to religious instruction with the normal children. Hence, we see the great need of training our teaching nuns and brothers so that they might be able to provide a Catholic education for our visually handicapped children. The summer session of the Sight Saving and Braille Institute at The Catholic University of America seems to be the answer to our problems.

Mentally retarded children approximate 2% of our school population. A great many of these children are educable and are not institutional cases. Throughout the country today more of this group are being educated than any other group of atypical children. Our parochial schools should provide special classes for the mentally retarded. The overwhelming majority of reading difficulties among the intellectually subnormal children are due primarily to instructional programs which are not adjusted to their needs, rather than to low intelligence itself. A special curriculum is needed for slow-learning groups. Speech impediments; visual and auditory difficulties are frequently encountered among the mentally retarded.

In recent years fathers and mothers of handicapped children have banded together and formed organizations for the purpose of helping one another. Pressure is being brought upon school authorities all over the country to provide adequate education for these exceptional children. The parents of blind children have banded together. There are over one hundred groups of parents of mentally retarded children throughout the country. According to the Federal Office of Education, in a fairly recent report, there are over four million exceptional children in the United States of school age. It is estimated that only 10% of the total are provided with proper educational facilities in special classes in day and residential schools.[3] Due to the activities of organizations of parents and friends of exceptional children, the public conscience is becoming aroused, and an improved understanding, knowledge, sympathy and better provisions are being made for the atypical child.

[3] *Proceedings* of Special Conference of the Woods Schools, Langhorne, Pa., March 20, 1951.

Mental deficiency looms large in the problem of juvenile delinquency. Every effort should be made to hold these socially maladjusted children in our parochial schools, and save them from a not specifically religious education. To drop them from our parochial schools means the dissociation from all Catholic influences. For in recent years we have noticed the change in the character of our institutions caring for delinquent children. The Church has gradually abandoned the field of caring for delinquent children, especially the boys, and has turned to the care of dependent and neglected children.[4] Therefore, we should endeavor to keep these socially maladjusted children in our parochial schools, near the Church and our religious, and educated under religious influences.

Between 10 and 15%—nearly two and a half million—of our school children need remedial reading, and unless this program is organized early and handled properly, scholastic failure will result. The problem of early diagnosis applies in this instance and in every case of an atypical child. The general opinion among educators today is that there is no single specific cause of poor reading. However, some physicians hold that certain children have specific reading disabilities that are inherited, and that these should be separated from other poor readers.

Standards for the education of handicapped children, as for all children, are set by state departments of education and local school systems. Many states have established minimum qualifications for teachers of exceptional children. The physician describes the kind of limitations and the kind of placement he believes essential, and the school endeavors to meet the situation. Special education; trained teachers; individual testing and vocational planning are all needed in our Catholic elementary and secondary schools today, if we ever hope to attain our goal of having every Catholic child in a Catholic school.

Special education and caring for the exceptional child confronts us with many problems. According to the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection this group "includes both the handicapped and the gifted, or children who deviate from the average child to such an extent as to require special treatment or

[4] *Catholic Charities Review*, September, 1951, p. 160.

training in order to make the most of their possibilities. It includes the blind and the partially seeing; the deaf and the hard of hearing; those defective in speech; children with lowered vitality; the mentally retarded; children with behavior problems—the nervous, the emotionally unstable, the delinquents; and the gifted."

Education programs for the exceptional child should emphasize qualities which they hold in common with normal children. Existing programs should be adapted to the needs of the atypical child; and he should, as far as possible, participate in the normal school activities. Special class programs should always have in mind the return of the child as soon as possible to the regular class. The problems of these children may be medical, psychological, social as well as educational. Co-operation of the parents with the school authorities is necessary. A well-rounded curriculum would include vocational guidance; training and placement methods; supervised recreational activities and participation in group activities with children of the same age.

At the beginning of every school year every child should receive a vision test, a hearing test with the audiometer, a diagnostic speech test and a thorough medical examination. In this way we may obtain an early diagnosis. Many different kinds of handicaps should receive different kinds of professional attention. We are now recognizing that each individual is substantially different from another, and that each is in need of an individual approach.

According to the White House Conference (1950), there are over a million children between the ages of five and eighteen who have defective speech, while only 60,000 now receive care.[5] Approximately 30% of the children who enter school have indistinct, disordered or delayed speech. Over 1½ million children stutter or stammer, while another million need help from some other undesirable speech habit. Over three million children have impaired hearing, and nearly twenty thousand children are in schools or classes for the deaf. Over six million children are of lowered vitality, and forty thousand are in open-air schools or classes. Last year there was a 10% increase in the number of children partaking of the school lunch program, bringing the

[5] *White House Conference on Child Health and Protection* (New York: Century, 1931).

number to nearly nine million in the country. Provision should also be made for the two million children in the country who are especially gifted. The schools should strive to provide the opportunity and incentive gifted children and youth require in order to develop in accordance with their potentiality and promise.[6] Besides, there are several groups of orthopedically handicapped children who could attend our parochial schools if some attention were given to this matter.

Article 13 of the Children's Charter reads as follows: "For every child who is blind, deaf, crippled, or otherwise physically handicapped, and for the child who is mentally handicapped, such measures as will early discover and diagnose his handicap, provide care and treatment, and so train him that he may become an asset to society rather than a liability." Let us sincerely hope that greater efforts may be made in the field of special education in our parochial school system so that every Catholic child may enjoy a Catholic school education despite his or her handicap, and thus provide a Christian education for *all* of God's children.

WILLIAM F. JENKS, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

[6] *The Gifted Child*, Edited by Paul Witty (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1951).

"THIS IS A DEEP MYSTERY"

The following line of St. Paul to the Colossians has engaged the attention of scholars in the past, and continues to do so at the present time: "I rejoice now in the sufferings I bear for your sake; and what is lacking of the sufferings of Christ I fill up in my flesh for his body, which is the Church" (1: 24). Commentators discuss the force and implications of certain terms, but there seems to be agreement on the main issue. What puzzles the casual observer is the fact that anything should be "lacking of the sufferings of Christ," since these were of infinite merit. But whether we follow the above translation, which is that of the Confraternity Edition, or the translation of Canon Knox, "I help to pay off the debt which the afflictions of Christ leave still to be paid," the point at issue is, that Paul suffers "for your sake" and that with his sufferings he pays off what is lacking, not in the merits of Christ, but in the merits of "his body, which is the Church."

Our Holy Father, in his Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* (of June 29, 1943), clarifies this point in the following lucid manner: "This also must be held, marvelous though it may seem: Christ has need of his members. . . . This is not because He is indigent and weak, but rather because He has so willed it for the greater glory of His spotless Spouse. Dying on the Cross, He left to His Church the immense treasure of His Redemption, toward which she contributed nothing. But when those graces come to be distributed, not only does He share this work of sanctification with His Church, but He wills that in some way it be due to her action. This is a deep mystery, and an inexhaustible subject of meditation, that the salvation of many depends on the prayers and voluntary penances which the members of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ offer for this intention . . ."

In his Encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor* (1928) Pius XI wrote as follows: "Christ, suffering in His Mystical Body, with reason desires to have us as companions in His own acts of expiation. He asks to be united with us for, since we 'are the body of Christ and member of member' (*I Cor.* 12:27), in so far as the head suffers, so also should the members suffer with it" (Cf. *I Cor.* 12:26).

There is really nothing new in this exposition. We may test the oldest sources of Christian spirituality and we shall find this doctrine deeply imbedded everywhere, beginning with the inspired writings down to the most recent spiritual works. However, what was believed at least implicitly, is now being brought forth with explicit clarity and with the convincing assurance that this new aspect of the ancient truth will afford us effective help and consolation in our present needs as well as new splendor in the glory to come hereafter. The difference between the older (if we may say so) and commonly more immediate conception of sufferings and merit, and the new aspect just referred to, is, that usually Christians think first of themselves, of their own salvation and sanctification, especially at the time of trial and tribulation, whereas in this new picture the individual approach and action take on a corporate outlook and merit. Those who "are Christ's" are made to feel very emphatically that they are not marching alone on the Royal Highway of the Cross, but that they are accompanied by a vast army, all of them tracing the steps of their great leader, the Highpriest; and thus bearing "one another's burdens" they "will fulfill the law of Christ" (*Gal.* 6:2) who "is the head of the body, the Church" (*Col.* 1:18).

In this way the imitation of Christ, which has been the keynote of all Christian perfection from the very beginning, takes on additional impetus and a new spiritual glamor. There have been "animae victimae" since apostolic days: now their purpose in the divine plan of salvation shines forth in a more understandable and a more brilliant manner even to the rank and file of the Christian world. Also, the prayers and penances of hermits and cloistered religious will more effectively spread forth their spiritual aroma to those who previously failed to grasp their full significance. But above all, the world at large in its present dire distress will gain a deeper and more comforting understanding of human suffering and woe by a prayerful meditation, as our Holy Father points out, on the deep mystery of Christ's Mystical Body.

The lesson is this: when we pray, do penance or suffer, we are not alone; we are part of the numerous multitude of Christ's followers. But, what is more, our sufferings not merely assure us of Christ's love and gain merit for ourselves, but they contribute

effectively toward the salvation and sanctification of all the members of Christ's Mystical Self, and, finally, help to enhance, beautify and perfect "what things God has prepared for those who love him" (*I Cor.* 2:9). In this manner our love for the Crucified embraces His entire army. It becomes an apostolate, as St. Bonaventure expresses it so beautifully in his prayer "Transfige," when he asks the Saviour to pierce the marrow of his heart with a "vera serenaque et apostolica sanctissima caritate."

If, as our Holy Father says, the meditation on this deep mystery is inexhaustible, it may well lead us to a better understanding of the causes that have brought about the present world distress, and the havoc that this works even within the flock of Christ. Students of social, economic and political conditions as well as of the false philosophical trends that have either caused these conditions or have added to their confusion, are offering solutions that might seem plausible; but do they sound the depth of it all? Here comes to mind a statement which Our Saviour made on the eve of His Passion and which, after these many years, still awaits a full explanation. The atmosphere in the Cenacle was tense; emotions were astir; the disciples sad. Unfortunately, the Disciple whom Jesus loved seems to have recorded rather hurriedly those last sayings that fell so copiously from the Master's sacred lips. The statement reads so much better in Latin than in English. "Venit enim princeps hujus mundi," the Master says gravely, "et in me non habet quidquam: sed ut cognoscat mundus quia diligo Patrem, et sicut mandatum dedit mihi Pater, sic facio. Surgite, eamus hinc" (*John* 14:30-31). A dismal foreboding weighed heavily upon the disciples as they wended their way over the Brook Cedron to Gethsemani. The bitter Agony past, the mob appeared at the gate, and the Master held out His hands to be fettered. At that moment He resumed where He had left off in the Cenacle: "Sed haec est hora vestra, et potestas tenebrarum" (*Luke* 15:23).

The Master's voluntary surrender marked the beginning of the greatest tragedy ever witnessed—conceived and directed, as it was, by the archenemy of God and of all that is God's, "the prince of this world," "the power of darkness."

"That through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God" (*Acts* 14:21), is part of the earliest code of Christianity.

For, as the Master frequently warned, "If the world hates you, know that it hated me before you" (*John* 15:18); and again: "No servant is greater than his master. If they have persecuted me, they will persecute you also" (*John* 15:20). In fact, He made suffering the test and token of His followers: "He who does not take up his cross and follow me, is not worthy of me" (*Matt.* 10:38). Hence "all who want to live piously in Christ Jesus will suffer persecution (*II Tim.* 3:12). Reduced to its simplest formula, the Christian philosophy of suffering is this: Christ suffered, therefore I must suffer. In this way the Crucified is the answer to the age-old controversy of the origin of evil and human suffering, which had involved all ancient philosophers, and which even holy Job was unable to unravel with full satisfaction.

However, after the Ascension, the Shepherds of Christ's flock not only carry forward the lesson of Calvary and of the great price that was paid there for our Redemption, but they were emboldened to point out in plain and straightforward language "the power of darkness" that seeks to deprive us of that price by its iniquitous and incessant assaults. St. Peter seizes upon David's boldest metaphor, the "leo rapiens et rugiens" (*Psalms* 21:13), to depict the ravages of Satan among the flock of Christ. "For your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goes about seeking someone to devour." He demands Christian resignation, but also conviction, courage and confidence, as behooves the Church Militant. "Knowing," he adds, as he surveys the world in his role as Supreme Shepherd, "that the same suffering befalls your brethren all over the world" (*I Pet.* 5:8-9). In the same vein Paul writes to the Ephesians: "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the Principalities and Powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of wickedness on high" (6:12).

The power of darkness has continued its attacks on the Church with cruel consistency, now in this land, now in that, usually starting off under the "sheep's clothing" of some humane pretext, but always ending up in a frenzy of unrestrained ferocity. There is a question whether the horrors that we must witness in certain parts of the world today have ever been equalled in history. We search our vocabulary to describe them, let alone name them, and we fail. It is unthinkable that the outrages inflicted on man

and mankind today could be conceived and devised by the human mind, no matter how low its perversity. Terms like inhuman and infrahuman or even beastly are still inadequate. The right name is diabolical or satanic, for these attributes cannot but stem from the lowest depths of hell. Without attempting any apocalyptic interpretations, we cannot help recognizing "the beast that comes out of the abyss" (*Apoc.* 11:7).

Two world wars followed in close succession, and still the world remains alarmed. Wide areas are devastated; a large portion of the culture that our forefathers built up was ruthlessly destroyed because of "military necessity." Whole nations are driven from their homelands where they had lived a thousand years. The bulwark of the nation, the home and the family, have been disrupted and scattered to the winds. We have no means of knowing how many thousands or millions have been killed under infamous tortures, or how many are starving under life-long bondage, at slave labor, in concentration camps. Meanwhile the most precious thing in this life and the next is being rooted out of the souls of old and young—the belief in God. What the French Revolution demanded has been given to our generation with compound interest. Yes, men do have Equality, but like beasts they must share it in the dust whence they came. They are given so-called Liberty, but its exercise is left to the dictates and whips of the self-constituted task-masters of the masses. And Fraternity has come to mean fratricide of both soul and body.

Perhaps more martyrs have gone to heaven in the last decades than ever before. But not all have the strength or grace of martyrdom. The winnowing process continues and many fall by the wayside. Better than ever, people now understand the "Our Father" or those ancient prayers of David, crying to heaven: "Why, O Lord, dost thou stand afar off, why hide thyself in time of trouble?" (*Psalms* 10:1). Even our spiritual leaders are anxiously seeking to find explanations and the proper answers, in order to convince their flock that the "Ancient of days" (*Dan.* 7:22) still rules in heaven. As priests and directors seek the hidden plans of Divine Providence, the Master's word to Nicodemus comes to mind: "Thou art a teacher in Israel and dost not know these things?" (*John* 7:10); or His rebuke to the wavering disciples on their way to Emmaus: "O foolish ones and

slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Did not the Christ have to suffer these things before entering into his glory?" (*Luke* 24:25-26).

The numerous appeals from Peter's Throne that have in recent days flooded the Christian world, asking for crusades of prayers and penances, for filial recourse to the Mother of God and of men, and especially the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis,* strike us like the Book of Consolation of Isaias the Prophet (ch. 40 ss.). In this Encyclical our Holy Father begs us to concentrate our meditation upon this deep mystery so that our vision may be expanded; that we may better understand the Saviour's word, "Misereor turbae" (*Matt.* 15:32); that we may see Christ's Empire in its entirety and constantly remind the faithful "that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come that will be revealed in us" (*Rom.* 8:18). And this glory is not that of the individual soul, but of all those who shall be "written in the book of life of the Lamb" (*Apoc.* 21:27). As they must march in unison behind the Saviour on the Royal Highway of the Cross, even so shall they reign with Christ, not individually, but as a victorious army. They must learn to share the common fate, to "bear each other's burden," to labor and suffer one for the other, and thus participate in the glory of all. As St. Paul puts it: "Rather are we to practise the truth in love, and so grow up in all things in him who is the head, Christ" (*Eph.* 4:15). The role of charity which is "the bond of perfection," and which by virtue of what the Pontifical calls the "lex mirabilis" unites all the members in a mystical organism here below, will be seen in all its power and glory "when that which is perfect has come" (*I Cor.* 13:9). In this approach the priest must visualize individual souls and his entire flock as an army of the elect to fight the army of evil. The thought and conviction of solidarity will give unity, and unity will give strength. We are fighting and suffering, not single-handed, but in organized columns, with our Leader ahead, whose Cross imparts to all suffering a mystical glow. The "Imperet illi Deus" of St. Michael is our shield; "In hoc signo vinces," our sword. "Regnavit a ligno Deus."

Our Holy Father remarks pointedly: "It is the will of Jesus Christ that the whole body of the Church, no less than the individual members, should resemble Him" (*Myst. Corp.*). In line

with this the Seraphic Doctor writes: "As God permitted Christ the Head of the Church to be exposed to the flood of sufferings, even so He wanted His Body the Church to suffer probation and purgation to the end of the world" (*Lignum Vitae*). Hence the words "Sicut mandatum dedit mihi Pater" apply both to Christ's mortal as well as to His immortal or mystical Body. If proof were needed that the Catholic Church has Christ as its Founder, the unremitting sufferings of the Church Militant would furnish that proof. When on Calvary, as the Fathers tell us, the Church flowed from the opened wound of His sacred Side, it was the Church's birthday and the crimson mark of the Saviour's Blood remained on her for a witness and a constant reminder. St. Bonaventure even goes so far as to say that in the Fifth Word on the Cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" the Saviour, who could not be forsaked by God, felt forsaken at that moment by those numberless Christians who were still not His members (*Vitis mystica*, X).

St. Paul, the champion of the doctrine of the Mystical Body, carries his theme to its glorious fulfillment. Well may we surmise that the idea first flashed upon him with penetrating power when on his way to Damascus he was suddenly halted by the voice from on high: "Saul, Saul, why dost thou persecute me?" (*Acts* 22:7). Stunned and bewildered he reflected whether Jesus, the Founder of these hated Christians, could still be among them and share their sufferings. He needed time to think and to pray, and he arose as the fervent champion of Christ's Mystical Body, meanwhile fully conscious of the Master's words to Ananias: "I will show him how much he must suffer for my name" (*Acts* 9:16).

Proud of "the marks of the Lord Jesus Christ" in his body (*Gal.* 6:17) he went forth preaching the Word, "building up the body of Christ" (*Eph.* 4:12). St. Paul was a good builder; he looked forward to the finished edifice, "to perfect manhood, to the mature measure of the fulness of Christ" (*Eph.* 4:14). Paul knew the mind of Christ. He may be called an idealist, but his ideal was not a dream; it was the clear vision of the plan in the mind of his Master. He boasts that "the truth of Christ" is in him (*II Cor.* 11:10); that it is "Christ who speaks in me" (*II Cor.* 13:3). He felt called to announce "the good tidings of the unfathomable riches of Christ, and to enlighten all men as to what is the dis-

pensation of the mystery which has been hidden from eternity in God" (*Eph.* 3:8-9). The climax of his apostolate was that all the faithful should "comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know Christ's love" (*Eph.* 3:18-19). The Master had prophesied: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself" (*John* 12:32). This was the dominant motif in the drama of Redemption, and from it the Apostle leads on to the grand finale. Christ "loved the Church," he exclaims, "and delivered himself up for her, that he might sanctify her, cleansing her in the bath of water by means of the word, in order that he might present to himself the Church in all her glory, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she might be holy and without blemish" (*Eph.* 5:26-27). This is "the bride, the Spouse of the Lamb" (*Apoc.* 21:9)—"a deep mystery, and in inexhaustible subject of meditation."

THOMAS PLASSMANN, O.F.M.

New York, N. Y.

He was one of those polite preachers who never cite the Holy Fathers, nor even the Sacred Evangelists, by their proper names, because they deem that practice vulgar. He called Saint Matthew the "Historian Angel," and referred to Saint John as the "Eagle of Patmos." And so on . . . to begin with "Blessed, praised and glorified be the Holy Sacrament above all things," etc. . . . —no, the reverend father *Predicator Major* would have abhorred the neglect of a tittle of these things, though St. Paul himself had strenuously maintained that they were all evidences of his not having a grain of gravity, a drop of devotion, a crumb of conscience, a morsel of marrow, or a pinch of penetration. Convince him if you could!

—Joseph F. Isla, S.J. *The History of Friar Gerund de Campazas*

Answers to Questions

THE PRESENCE OF GOD IN THE SOUL

Question: Can it be said that the Holy Ghost is present in the soul in a more excellent manner through sanctifying grace than Our Lord is present through Holy Communion?

Answer: If one compares the sacramental presence of Christ *merely as such* in the body of the communicant with the indwelling of the Holy Trinity through sanctifying grace in the soul, appropriated to the Holy Spirit, the latter would seem to be more excellent. For the sacramental presence of Our Lord *as such* can be had even by one in mortal sin. However, if we compare the sacramental presence enjoyed through a worthy communion, with the presence of the Godhead through sanctifying grace, the former can justly be regarded as superior in excellence, since it includes the latter (inasmuch as an increase of sanctifying grace is an effect of Holy Communion) and in addition bestows on the communicant the living and life-giving humanity of the Word Incarnate.

THE SACRAMENTS FOR DYING NON-CATHOLICS

Question: It seems to be admitted that a priest can confer certain sacraments on non-Catholics who are dying unconscious, especially on those who have lived as good Christians. Now, I have a difficulty in regard to the condition that the dying person must be *unconscious.* It can happen that one who appears to be unconscious is fully aware of what is going on around him. Hence, a priest who follows the practice in question might at times administer sacraments to a person who is fully conscious and is internally repudiating the sacramental rite. In view of the reverence due to the sacraments, would not this possibility have to be considered in justifying this practice?

Answer: The practice to which the questioner refers is approved by many reliable theologians. It is justified on the score that the

general intention of doing God's will and of partaking of whatever helps He has established for the eternal salvation of men (which intention is present in many non-Catholics) implicitly contains the intention of receiving the sacraments beneficial to a dying person. It is generally held that as long as the non-Catholic is conscious the sacraments should not be conferred on him, unless he expresses a desire to become a Catholic (Canon 731, §2); though some theologians teach, with Noldin-Schmitt (*Summa theologiae moralis* [Innsbruck, 1940], III, n. 297), that sometimes a priest may impart sacramental absolution to a dying heretic even while he is conscious, after the sick person has been roused to acts of repentance, in such wise that he is not aware of the sacramental rite. Usually, however, the sacraments (Baptism, Penance and Extreme Unction) should be given only to one who has lost consciousness, as far as appearances go, and probably will not recover it. As the questioner states, the sick person may actually be conscious and internally opposed to the priest's ministrations, in which event the sacraments are not validly received. But the principle *Sacramenta propter homines* will justify the practice, even in view of this possibility. It is better that the sacraments be administered invalidly to many rather than that one who could profit by them be deprived of them at the time of supreme need, the hour of death.

A PROBLEM IN PASTORAL PRUDENCE

Question: Is it proper for a pastor to demand that all marriage cases brought to the other priests of the parish be submitted to him personally? It can happen that a curate will meet a couple involved in an invalid marriage who desire him to arrange for the rectification of their unfortunate state, but object to having the case presented to the pastor. What is to be said of the pastor's ruling, in view of such circumstances?

Answer: That the pastor, generally speaking, has the right to be informed of all invalid unions and similar cases relative to matrimony existing in his parish cannot be denied; and the ruling of a pastor that all such problems be brought to his notice might be motivated by sincere and ardent pastoral zeal. However, to

make such a rule without allowing any exceptions at the discretion of the curates would ordinarily be imprudent, as is evident from the case supposed by the questioner. A parish priest may be a man of outstanding virtue and intelligence; yet, there will always be some parishioners who will prefer to bring their marriage difficulties to one of the other priests, stipulating that the case shall not be referred to the pastor. Surely, it is the more prudent and the more magnanimous procedure for the pastor to allow the assistant priests full freedom and discretionary power in investigating and rectifying such cases, without referring the matter to him. Indeed, in the event that a marriage of conscience takes place before one of the assistants, with the permission of the Ordinary, the assistant is strictly forbidden to divulge the matter even to the pastor (Canon 1105). Moreover, there could be other instances in which an assistant would be empowered and even obliged by virtue of the natural law to keep a marriage case from the knowledge of the pastor. Of course, if a marriage is to be revalidated, the curate must be sure that he has the requisite delegation, either from the pastor or from the ordinary.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

COMPLINE CEREMONIES

Question: I attend a small mission where we are preparing to chant Compline in the vernacular according to the Gregorian melody, while I am to supply to the parts for the celebrant and Hebdomadarian. Since the cope is not a liturgical vestment (being used by minor clerics and cantors), would it be permissible during this vernacular rendition of the official night prayer to vest and assist the singing in the sanctuary?

Since lector is even a lower order than acolyte, may not an altar boy chant the short lesson?

Answer: The instructions for Compline when sung or chanted in Latin are very specific. The same regulations certainly hold when Compline is being done in the vernacular.

We are told not to wear the cope for Compline even when it is chanted after Vespers. Why allow ourselves to violate this prescription merely because it is now being done in the vernacular? We see absolutely no justification for the celebrant wearing the cope in this ceremony.

Since cantors are allowed to sing the lesson and responses we see no violation of rubrics in allowing the altar boys to act in this capacity, provided they are properly trained.

DISTRIBUTION OF HOLY COMMUNION

Question: Recently I have been confused about the prayers immediately before the distribution of Holy Communion? Do we recite *vestri* or *nostri?* Do we ever use the singular form?

Answer: The form for the *Misereatur* and the *Indulgentiam* is always the second person plural and never the first person plural.

The singular form is never used for the distribution of Holy Communion in church even though there is only one person who is receiving the Eucharist. The singular form is used only when one person is communicating as on a sick call or bringing Holy Communion to a sick person.

ASPERGES CEREMONY

Question: Where should the genuflection be made at the altar when giving the asperges, in plano or on the step? In some parishes there is the custom of going down the middle aisle during the asperges. Is it necessary that the aspergillum be so filled so that many get a shower on new hats, dresses, etc.? Also, what recommendation for sprinkling vestments after blessing them so as not to spot or stain them.

Answer: Authors on ceremonies direct us to genuflect on the floor and not on the step as we approach the altar before the asperges.

We are permitted to conduct the ceremony of the asperges in one of two ways. The celebrant may go to the communion railing and there sprinkle the people first those in the center and then those to his left and right. He may choose to go down the center

aisle and if so he sprinkles members of the congregation on the epistle side on the way down and those on the gospel side on his return to the altar. (S.R.C. #3114,2). Some authors direct the celebrant to sprinkle the people on each side alternately on his way down the center aisle and return to the altar with folded hands. These authors hold that it is unbecoming to sprinkle people on the back.

Care can be exercised in sprinkling the congregation by seeing to it that the aspergillum is not too full of water. Likewise, the celebrant can guard against sprinkling people too close to the aisle.

In blessing vestments one must use his common sense and good judgment about the amount of holy water to be used. If there is danger of sprinkling too much water on materials that soil readily, one can reverse the vestment so that the water falls on the inside or lining of the garment.

MASS CEREMONIES

Question: (a) At the communicantes of the Mass are the hands joined when the celebrant makes a reverence to the cross?

(b) Is it necessary to turn and bow to the cross each time the Holy Name is mentioned during the introit or epistle? In some Masses it appears several times.

Answer: (a) As the celebrant finishes the communicantes he joins his hands but does not bow his head.

(b) The general rubrics about bowing are simple enough. Whenever the name of Jesus occurs we are instructed to bow to the cross of the altar; hence during the introit and the epistle of the Mass. When the Blessed Sacrament is exposed the bow made at the occurrence of the name of Jesus is made to the Blessed Sacrament. Normally during the reading of the gospel the bow is made to the book except when the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, when the bow is made to It.

HOLY COMMUNION IN HOSPITAL

Question: What is the approved way of distributing Holy Communion to the sick in a hospital, all on the same floor or on

different floors? Would it be necessary to have a small table or corporal in each room or would you go from room to room carrying the ciborium as though moving along the communion rail?

Answer: When Holy Communion is to be distributed to a number of sick persons in a hospital on the same or different floors the priest carries the ciborium or large pyx along without purifying his fingers as he passes from floor to floor. In the first room only he recites all the prayers prescribed in the Ritual before Holy Communion of the sick. In each of the other rooms he shall say Misereatur tui, etc., Indulgentiam, etc., Ecce Agnus Dei, etc. and (once only) Domine non sum dignus, etc., followed by Accipe, frater (soror), etc., or Corpus Domini, etc. In the last room the priest adds the Dominus vobiscum and the prayer Domine sancte, to be said in the plural form. Then he is instructed to give the blessing with the Blessed Sacrament. On his return to the church or chapel he is to recite the other prayers that are prescribed.

SURPLICE IN HEARING CONFESSIONS

Question: Is it proper for the priest to wear the surplice when hearing confessions?

Answer: In the Roman Ritual we read *"superpelliceo et stola violacei coloris utatur, prout tempus vel locorum feret consuetudo."* In many dioceses, synodal regulations prescribe the wearing of the surplice and stole. However, in many places the wearing of the surplice has been eliminated. It is safe to follow local or diocesan custom in this regard.

MARRIAGE IN THE SANCTUARY

Question: (a) In performing the sacrament of matrimony are the bride and groom allowed to enter the sanctuary?

(b) In exchanging the marriage vows do the bride and groom repeat only the Christian name?

Answer: (a) Authors disagree on whether or not the bride and groom are allowed to enter the sanctuary for the marriage

ceremony. Diocesan regulations and local custom will be a decisive factor in solving the problem of our inquirer. Martinucci, Mueller and Wuest-Mullaney in giving their directions for the marriage ceremony have the bridal couple enter the sanctuary. Fortescue and O'Connell definitely forbid the bridal couple to enter the sanctuary for the ceremony and have it taking place at the communion rail.

These last mentioned authors, basing their rubrics on the principle that the laity should not enter the sanctuary during liturgical services, have many decisions of the Holy See in their favor. Others maintain that the presence of the bridal couple in the sanctuary for the nuptial blessing is an exception to the general rule. They further argue that their position is justified by the words of the rubric *"super eos,"* since it is difficult to see how this direction can be carried out in a large church and sanctuary unless the bride and groom are kneeling at the altar.

Fr. Mahoney in the *Clergy Review* holds for introducing them within the sanctuary. He states that "it is clearly permitted by many writers, it is in accordance with the directions of the rubrics, and it is an added solemnity which many Catholic couples value very highly indeed." To those who argue that women are not allowed in the sanctuary we hold with the writer of the *American Ecclesiastical Review* (Dec., 1935) that the occasion of the nuptial blessing is "a remarkable exception to this strict law."

(b) It is permissible to use both the Christian name and surname, although the Ritual seems to indicate by the letter "N." only the Christian name.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Reviews

MAN AND SOCIETY. Second Edition. By Francis J. Haas. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1952. Pp. xxi + 554. $4.50.

Bishop Haas once characterized the late Msgr. John A. Ryan, his mentor and devoted friend, as a man with an "unaffected passion for truth, searching for the major difficulty and meeting it, fairness to adversaries, intolerance only with sham and make-believe and, throughout, the humility of the scholar." The disciple has proved to be a worthy follower of the master, for these same qualities of honesty, integrity, and single-minded devotion to the truth are reflected on every page of Haas' *Man and Society*, first published in 1930 and reprinted in February of this year in a second edition completely revised and substantially rewritten.

To a certain extent the first edition of *Man and Society* suffered from the disability or the handicap of being classified as a college textbook, with the unfortunate result that its circulation was limited more or less, thought not exclusively, to academic circles. Let us hope that the second and revised edition will find its way into the hands not only of college and university students but of labor leaders, publicists, businessmen, government officials—and, above all, parish priests, who may be expected to welcome its discovery as the answer to a prayer.

As long ago as 1908 Msgr. Ryan wrote an article for *The American Ecclesiastical Review* in which he emphasized the importance of the social sciences in the seminary curriculum. "While there is little danger that the Catholic clergy of America will lose sympathy with the desire of the masses for industrial freedom and industrial opportunity," he said, many years later, paraphrasing the original article, "there is a real danger that their sympathy will not be equaled by their knowledge." Accordingly, he continues, in the words of the original article, it is necessary that he receive in the seminary social instruction which will be fundamental and scientific and will be,

> sufficiently extensive to make him acquainted with the vital facts of current social conditions, tendencies, and doctrines; which will be sufficiently stimulating to give him a lasting interest in these phenomena; and which will be sufficiently thorough to enable him to deal intelligently, justly, and charitably with the practical situations that he will be compelled to face afterward. Here, again, we may profitably perhaps take example from the experience of some of our brethren in the Old World. It has been frequently asserted that

one explanation of the failure of the clergy of France to retain their hold upon large masses of their countrymen, is to be found in their inadequate and impractical seminary training. It is not impossible that we shall one day find ourselves similarly impotent on account of our insufficient instruction in social problems.

Among the "practical situations" which the priest will "be compelled to face afterward" he lists the following by way of illustration:

just wages, just interest, just profits, a living wage for the worker versus normal profits and interest for the employer and the capitalist; reducing wages to maintain dividends; the responsibility of stockholders, including educational and charitable institutions, for the improper practice of corporations; stock-watering and other questionable methods of high finance; the aims and methods of monopoly; the aims and methods of the labor union; socialism, materialistic and non-materialistic . . .

Commenting on this article thirty years later, Dr. Ryan was able to note, with justifiable satisfaction, that "today practically all our seminaries provide courses in economics or sociology or both." This is undoubtedly true, but if Dr. Ryan were alive today, he would probably be the first to admit that while we have made a good beginning, we still have a long way to go in gearing the seminary curriculum to the needs of the day. He would also be the first to sympathize with the busy parish priest whose good intentions—which were stimulated, but hardly more than that, by an abbreviated and somewhat theoretical seminary course in sociology or economics—easily and very understandably gives way, in the hurly-burly of the active ministry, to a feeling of frustration, largely for lack of adequate reading material on the application of social ethics to the very practical and ever-changing problems of the socio-economic order.

Granted that our seminaries are doing a much better job than they have ever done before in carrying out the program of social education outlined by Dr. Ryan in 1908, the fact remains that the average parish priest of 1952, almost as much as his predecessor of 1908, is in danger of losing his initial interest in social reform if only because he himself recognizes, better than anyone else, that his "sympathy with the desire of the masses for industrial freedom and industrial opportunity" is not equaled by his knowledge of specific social problems. He hesitates, therefore, to take a stand on specific issues of the day and gradually lapses into silence or takes refuge in barren and rather harmless generalities.

That is why we have suggested that the parish priest of the United States will welcome *Man and Society* as the answer to a prayer. It is just the short of book he has been looking for and just the sort of book

he needs to bring him up-to-date on the application of seminary theory to the ever-changing social, economic and political problems he is confronted with in the exercise of his sacred ministry. We have a good number of more or less adequate books on Catholic social philosophy but relatively few books—good, bad or indifferent—on the practical application of Catholic social philosophy to the immediate problems of the day. Of the few that we do have *Man and Society* is unquestionably one of the very best. It is recommended very highly.

The twenty-one chapters of *Man and Society*—replacing the sixteen chapters of the earlier edition—are arranged under several general headings: Man, Social Life, Family Life, Economical Life, Occupational Life, and Supernatural Life. The book is a perfect combination of the theoretical and the practical, differing in this respect from the typical treatise on special ethics, on the one hand, and the typical treatise on sociology or economics, on the other. Catholic social theory is clearly and authoritatively expounded on each of the subjects listed above, but never in a vacuum. As we have already suggested, the emphasis throughout the entire book is on the application of Catholic social theory to current problems, with the author—like his distinguished teacher, John A. Ryan—"searching for the major difficulty and meeting it" reasonably and calmly, with "fairness to adversaries," and with the "humility of the scholar."

Almost all of the problems which Dr. Ryan says were receiving inadequate attention in seminary manuals and seminary instruction in 1908 (cf. above), are adequately covered in Bishop Haas' timely volume, with the possible exception of "the aims and methods of the labor movement." It is to be regretted, as another reviewer has already suggested, that *Man and Society* does not include a full-bodied treatment of labor problems and labor ethics—all the more so in view of the fact that Bishop Haas is by all odds the best qualified person in the United States to write the standard treatise on this important subject. At the present time the best available compendium on labor ethics is John A. Ryan's masterly article entitled "Labor Unions" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia.* A model of brevity and scholarly accuracy, it is one of the best things Dr. Ryan ever wrote, but it is now somewhat out of date and needs to be revised in the light of changed conditions. Bishop Haas' extensive experience as a labor conciliator (he has been instrumental in settling more than 1800 labor disputes) and his intimate and unexcelled knowledge of trade union theory and practice suggests that he is the logical person to take up where Dr. Ryan left off and write the definitive Catholic book on labor problems in the United States.

Of all the subjects treated in *Man and Society*—starting from the

nature of man and proceeding logically to the subject of an organized world society—two in particular have received special attention in news releases and scholarly reviews: the Industry Council plan and federal health insurance. The author's treatment of both of these important subjects is cited as a perfect example of his ability to distinguish unemotionally between principle and prejudice and to make Catholic social teaching come to life in terms of present-day conditions.

Bishop Haas was described by Monsignor Ryan (in his autobiography, *Social Doctrine in Action*), as "one of the most competent authorities on labor conditions in the United States and one of the most valued advisers to government officials in that field." The revised edition of *Man and Society* is sufficient evidence that Bishop Haas is more than that. He is one of the most objective and most authoritative American commentators not only on the subject of labor ethics but on the whole range of Catholic social teaching. His writing is the fruit of a lifetime of scholarly research and practical experience and is permeated unobtrusively with a spirit of priestly zeal for the salvation of souls. His episcopal motto—*In Christo Justitia*—might well have been adopted, with perfect propriety, as the subtitle of *Man and Society*.

GEORGE G. HIGGINS

MEMORIES OF POPE PIUS X. By Cardinal Merry del Val. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1951. Pp. xvii + 81. $1.50.

A fully documented life of Blessed Pope Pius X has yet to be written. Our knowledge of this great Pontiff from published sources must come from a few popular biographies and a number of special studies on his various works and accomplishments. All future historians of Pius X writing of his early years and of the period preceding his election to the papacy will rely heavily upon the monumental work of Canon Marchesan, *Papa Pio X nella sua Vita e nella sua Parole* which appeared in 1905 and is now exceedingly rare. The present volume by Cardinal Merry del Val is small in size but very important for the facts it presents for the first time and also for the comprehensive portrait he gives of the kindly, saintly, and extraordinarily able Pontiff who was Pius X.

None was in better position to write authoritatively on Pius X than Cardinal Merry del Val for the period extending from 1903 until the death of the Pontiff in 1914. A brilliant official at the court of Leo

XIII, Msgr. Merry del Val was elected secretary to the Sacred College of Cardinals in the conclave that ended with the election of Cardinal Sarto on Aug. 4, 1903, and the new Pope made him his Secretary of State on October 18 and a Cardinal in the following November. Until the death of Pius X eleven years later, Cardinal Merry del Val was the beloved friend, trusted confidant, and tireless assistant of Pius X in all his many labors and projects for the welfare of the Church.

The "sketches" and "personal reminiscences," as the Cardinal calls his book, are carefully selected and beautifully written. He wishes above all to leave to others some of his own impressions of the spiritual gifts and virtues, of the creative abilities, and of the warm, kindly heart of the Pope whom he so much admired and revered. We see, for example, the newly elected Pope Pius X at his first reception of the diplomatic corps where he captivates all with his personal charm and simplicity; we see him alone in his office writing out the outlines for his sermons, addresses, and letters or busily engaged in planning such gigantic projects as the codification of the canon law of the Church. We learn that Pius X was endowed with rare artistic taste and with a natural talent and love for good music. In his frequent discussions with Merry del Val, we are told that Pius X, who ordered the reform of ecclesiastical music, was strongly averse to prohibiting polyphonic music in church; that he looked upon the views of some enthusiasts who would banish all music that is not simply Gregorian chant from our churches as "exaggerated folly."

Cardinal Merry del Val's admirable analysis of the holiness of Pius X has been officially borne out by the documents recently published by the Postulator of the Cause. His humility and devotion were known only to his intimates; his love of poverty and charity for the poor were known to all. His zeal for souls was reflected in his sermons and instructions given at the Vatican as well as in his numerous Encyclicals and Decrees which aimed to restore Christ to the minds and hearts of the faithful. To complete the warm and attractive portrait of Pius X which he offers us, the Cardinal points out his personal charm and his kindly sense of humor.

It is good to have these sketches of Pius X made newly available to the many clients of the saintly Pontiff. This book was first published in London in 1939. Many new friends of Blessed Pius X will be made by reading this book which is attractively printed and enhanced by the excellent foreword of the late Cardinal Hayes, which was written for a projected American edition.

JOSEPH B. COLLINS, SS.

GREGORIAN CHANT ANALYZED AND STUDIED. By Marie Pierik. St. Meinrad, Indiana: The Grail, 1951. Pp. 126. $3.00.

Miss Pierik is herewith putting into print the teaching she has been giving for about thirty years. It is her hope, according to the preface, to give a simplified presentation of the theory of Gregorian music so that the ordinary layman can join with the faithful in giving what she calls an appropriately artistic and scientific rendition of this sung prayer of the Church. Hence, she says, her manual is a presentation based on principles rather than upon method, and the principles are those to be found in the preface to the Vatican Graduale published in 1907.

The book has a textbook character and covers the History of Gregorian Chant, the History of the Proper of the Mass; the ordinary mechanics of notation, Latin pronunciation, vocal theory, rhythm, and finally a detailed analysis of selections from the Kyriale.

Of course, it is easy to see that Miss Pierik repudiates for the most part the findings of Dom Mocquereau of Solesmes and everybody since who has followed his line of scholarship in the investigation of the Gregorian tradition; it cannot be said, however, that the method she espouses is any clearer than the Solesmes method, even though she professes to prefer principles to method. In fact, her own efforts indicate that it is not possible to apply principles without some scientific method. Incidentally, Miss Pierik's terminology, both liturgical and musical, will puzzle a good number of teachers and nearly all beginners in this art.

We all realize that the rhythmic signs of Solesmes are the copyright of the monks, but it will be a great surprise to Miss Pierik's students (at least in this country) to pick up a *Liber usualis,* or one of the many reductions of the same, and find the text full of these unexplained and mystical *sigla* after having gone through a textbook in which no mention was made of them. In fact, the only passing reference to the *Liber usualis* is given to a quotation on accentuation found in the 1934 edition. Does Miss Pierik expect her students to sing exclusively from copies of the Vatican Graduale? Or shall they ignore the rhythmic markings in the *Liber*? She gives no advice on the subject, as far as the reviewer can determine.

As long as the author has taken the trouble to give a *history* of Gregorian Chant, will it not be considered a notable omission to find nothing of what happened at Solesmes Abbey after the intensive study and archeological research labors of Dom Pothier were discontinued at his death in 1923? Would the student of Gregorian history be well instructed if he never came across the name of Dom Mocquereau or

Dom Gajard, or if he never heard of the *Paléographie* (after all, a considerable number of volumes) and *Le Nombre Musical*? You would expect Miss Pierik to give us at least a reason for not describing these items, even in an abridged history.

It is also a fact that Blessed Pius X did more than any modern pope towards restoring the Gregorian tradition, but it is hardly right to say that "Not until the advent of Pope Pius X to the pontifical throne did the Church furnish a pontiff who considered it his sacred duty to restore the lost heritage to the Church." After all, a history might include some of the efforts made by Benedict XIV, Leo XII, Pius VIII, Gregory XVI, Pius IX and Leo XIII, under whose pontificate Dom Pothier began his labors; most of these modern popes did something not only towards repressing abuses in church music, but in holding on to the chant as the ideal form of musical prayer.

Maybe it was Miss Pierik's intention to eschew controversy, but she could hardly hope to attain that laudable objective by ignoring historical facts and the decisive influences in this art.

JOHN C. SELNER, S.S.

CATHOLIC MORAL TEACHING ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROFITS IN THE MODERN CORPORATION. By George Francis Bardes. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1951. Pp. ix + 179. $2.00.

Regret has been voiced that papal social teaching has not been adequately and scientifically applied to American conditions, and for that reason has had little influence on American economists and business people. Indeed there has been a considerable amount of excellent commentary upon the Church's social teaching, but few Catholic scholars have been well enough versed in both moral theology and economic theory to develop a well-organized body of teaching that will command the respect of both moralists and economists. It is encouraging, therefore, to see a dissertation published at The Catholic University of America in the School of Sacred Theology which tackles a difficult problem in the business world from the moralist's viewpoint.

The subject, the distribution of profits in the modern corporation, treats only of a limited phase of a broad and complex institution, but we stand greatly in need of such studies. The author reveals sufficient acquaintance with economic theory and a wide range of theorists to avoid suggesting self-evident generalities and panaceas as solutions to the problems that any professional economist would instantly reject as

unrealistic and economically impossible. If Catholic social teaching is going to effect any solid influence on the modern business world, more work of this caliber must be produced.

The corporation dominates the American business scene. The structure of that institution, the peculiar circumstances that have prompted its evolution, the factors that determine its pricing policy, its costs and revenues, whether in the form of economic rent, interest, profits, or wages, are all subjects of strategic importance in determining the application of principles of justice in accord with Catholic moral teaching. This dissertation is concerned with these problems.

The author begins his work with a survey of the economic interpretation of the revenue known as profit, and aims particularly at a clarification of economic terminology essential to the understanding of this question. This involves a brief investigation of economic theory under competitive and monopolistic conditions. He then discusses the legal aspect of profit in the modern corporation, first, by presenting some observations on the extensive influence of the corporation on the American economy, then by taking up a consideration of some legal characteristics of the corporation pertinent to the discussion, and finally by emphasizing the well-known phenomenon of this legal entity, namely, the separation of ownership and control.

In the light of papal and other moral teaching, more lengthy attention is then given to the matter of just prices and wages, including the determination of value, the nature of the wage contract, and the possibilities of a family living wage. The demands of both commutative and social justice are stressed in relation to these questions.

The final three chapters deal with a synthesis of the concepts derived and their application, and a restatement of the conclusions reached. The rights of each factor to the profits are analyzed, with some emphasis focused upon the questionable right in justice of the stockholders to the residual revenue.

This treatment of the distribution of profits leaves one all the more aware of the immense complexity and difficulty surrounding the application of the principles of justice in the dynamic economy of America. Both economists and moralists may wish to question assumptions and positions taken by the author, but that he had the courage and guidance necessary to handle this controversial subject presages greater things to come. Typographically the work is excellent, and footnotes and bibliography are extensive.

WILLIAM J. LEE